University of Maryland Page 664
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Ctudont	COLLEGE	Evaluation	Ougetion	naira

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101

24

COMPOSITION

BURNS, MARGIE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

							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 yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1210/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.92
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1037/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.08
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1123/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.67
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	473/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	566/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.25
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	763/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.08
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1078/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.92
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1319/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.17
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	718/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1100/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.18
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	765/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.80
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1003/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.10
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	847/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.30
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:					0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	814/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	839/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.88
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	930/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	875/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		4	3	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	705/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.40
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
														- 				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	ajors	5	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		~						0	1	, ,	0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0			1			1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Εl	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -				_	m
				- 0		0	1					0	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcan	I L	
				I 0		Ot.	her					2						

?

1

University of Maryland Page 665
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201

18

COMPOSITION

BLOOM, RYAN I.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

	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	1	1	7	6	4.20	959/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	607/1522		4.25	4.26	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	535/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	322/1412		4.13	4.06	4.01	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	162/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	770/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	s 0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	264/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.67
Taskuus														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Λ	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4 22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448		4.71	4.71	4.63	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	478/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	-		372/1432		4.27		4.23	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	2	0	0		****/1221				3.86	****
5. Did dudiovibual teelmiques emidnee your understanding	O	12	_	O	2	O	Ü	2.55	/ 1221	3.02	3.75	3.75	3.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	390/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269		4.54	4.31	4.04	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	303/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.30
Fre	quency	7 Dis	tribu	ıt.i.or	า									
	12				-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	3			Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s 1	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 6			1			- 5						5 -		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 1		Ge	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	major	15
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0			- 7						5	_			3	-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0													_	
	Other								respons	es to b	e pran	IIIICan	LL	
I 0		Ot]	her					4	respons	es to L	e sign	illican		

University of Maryland Page 666
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301

22

COMPOSITION

TERHORST, RAYMO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	959/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	607/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	809/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	535/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	621/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	162/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	700/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1301/1517		4.47		4.62	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	4	7		573/1497					4.33
	=	-	_	-		_	•		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	514/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	478/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	4		4.27	448/1221					4.27
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	U	U	2	-	,	1.2/	440/1221	3.02	3.73	3.93	3.00	1.2/
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	468/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	540/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	299/1269		4.54			4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	182/ 854	3.73		4.02	3.87	
i. Were special techniques successiul	1	_	U	U	_	,	,	1.33	102/ 031	3.73	1.05	1.02	3.07	1.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	15	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 205			4.23	4.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	15	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 80		4.33	4.11	3.19	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.40	4.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		-	0	0	0	0	_		,	****	****			****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 34			4.30	4.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
			0		0	0			****/ 33	****	****			****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0		0	0		1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0		0	1		,	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	^^^	* * * *	4.49	4.11	^ ^ ^ ^

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO

22

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 666 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	3				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401

21

COMPOSITION

MCGURRIN JR, AN

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2007

Page 667

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

					Freque					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	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1433/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.43
-	_	tor make clear			1	0	1	0	1	1	4		1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00
		estions reflec			1	2	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1065/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.80
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	860/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.20
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1070/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	3.71
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1298/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.50
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1144/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.43
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1359/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.50
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1393/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	3.83
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1334/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.33
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1270/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.50
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	874/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.80
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1171/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.40
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1097/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	3.60
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	_	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	747/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.20
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	=			Ту	ne			Majors	
					ades Reasons 												, 	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 0 C 0		a		,				0	TT		0	37		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0			Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 2	D 0 F 0			ecti					1	ишии ,	\f				-la
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	۷	P 0		ET.	ectl	ves				1	#### - 1				_	111
				I 0		0-1	h					2	respons	es lo I	e sign	ııııcan	I L	
				Ι 0		Ut.	her					2						

?

0

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501

16

COMPOSITION

PEKARSKE, NICOL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 668

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			, 															
		General	L															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1220/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.90
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00
3. Did th	he exam qı	uestions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	7	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1248/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did of	ther evalu	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1324/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.50
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	892/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.90
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	753/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.10
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	1	2	1	1	5		1219/1500		4.10	4.18	4.16	3.70
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	714/1517		4.47	4.65	4.62	4.80
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1181/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.70
		Lecture																
		actor's lectures	_	_	7	0	0	1	1	0	1		1385/1440		4.32	4.45	4.40	3.33
		ctor seem intere		_	7	0	0	0	1	1	1		1353/1448		4.71	4.71	4.63	4.00
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	0			1241/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	3.67
		es contribute to			7	0	0	1	1	0	1		1320/1432			4.29	4.23	3.33
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1280				3.92	****
		-	_	d to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1277		4.52	4.34	4.13	****
				d open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1269		4.54	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	sstul		8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ution	1									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	ре			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	anir	 ed fo	or Ma	ajors	. – – –	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		1,00	7u11	-u 1	J_ 1'1C	ء ـ ١٠٠	,	,	Graduat	_	0	1.101	/ <u>_</u>	J
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		001	c. u.	-				•	onacr 9		. •	1,011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-		-	P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her					2			5-			
				? 0			-											

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0601 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Title COMPOSITION

KIDD, KATHLEEN Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

Page 669 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	2.82	1500/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	2.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1313/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	6	3	3.82	1061/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	871/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	973/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	839/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	963/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1379/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1142/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	6		1001/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3		4.11			4.31	4.29	4.24	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	2	5		1036/1432		4.27	4.29	4.23	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	2	0		****/1221			3.93	3.86	****
1,									·					
Discussion	_		_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	0	1		1187/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	0		1136/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	875/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	819/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	2.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	***	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	***	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	***	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	***	****	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work					_	•								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	***	****	4.49	4.11	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0601
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN

19

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 669 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majo	rs
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate (0 Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad 12	.2 Non-majo	or 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	here are not end	ugh
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	2			
				?	1					

University of Maryland Page 670
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701

19

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	n this course	0	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1338/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.67
		tor make clear			1	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1313/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.64
		estions reflec	_	_	0	3	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	873/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.11
		ations reflect			0	2	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1174/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.80
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	709/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.08
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	673/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.18
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	444/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.55
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	645/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.83
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	898/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			0	0	1	1	1	2	7		1155/1440				4.40	4.08
		tor seem inter		_	0	0	0	2	0	2	8		1271/1448			4.71	4.63	4.33
		_		xplained clearly	2	0	2	0	0	2	6		1056/1436			4.29	4.24	4.00
		es contribute to		•	1	0	2	0	0	4	5		1126/1432				4.23	3.91
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	1	6	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1154/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	2.60
		Discus			_	_		_										
				what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	4		. ,			4.10	3.92	4.17
				d to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	930/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.00
				d open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	875/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	sstul		7	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	****
				7														
				Frequ	iency	DIST	trib	101	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 s	8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В 5			1									3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	h			
				P 0	FIECCIVES						respons				_			
				I 0	Other					4	-		3					
				? 0			-											
				• •														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 671

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

5

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901

COMPOSITION

-				
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	ם אינ כמו

			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	1	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	462/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	499/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	366/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	295/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	214/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	240/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	630/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	16	2	3.95	1419/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	147/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.80
Legture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	512/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.86	602/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	514/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	394/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	879/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	Ω	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	237/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	398/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1		4.80	332/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	600/ 854		4.05	4.02	3.87	
_		<u> </u>												
Freq	uency	Dist	tribi	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	es Reasons					Туј	pe			Majors				
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 11		Red	 quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s 1	.5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6			-			-								
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 1	General 0			0 Under-grad 23		3	Non-	major	23					
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 1														

Electives

5

Other

University of Maryland Page 672
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001

23

COMPOSITION

FINDLAY, JOANNE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General	-	•	-	•	_	_	_	2 62	1256/1500	2 02	4 15	4 20	4 1 4	2 62
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	6	6	3		1356/1522		4.17	4.30	4.14	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	738/1522		4.25	4.26	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	2	2	0		****/1285		4.32	4.30	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	,		4.37	4.22	4.09	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4 0	1	1	3	4 7	3 7		1122/1412		4.13	4.06	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1 5	1		, 6	4.25	604/1381		4.36	4.08	3.93	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1	0	0	0	3 5	2 10	1		1276/1500 1471/1517		4.10	4.18	4.16 4.62	3.56 3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38			$4.47 \\ 4.22$	4.65 4.11		4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	U	U	2	4	,	4.30	525/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1238/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	965/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	965/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1036/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1001/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.29
Discussion		_	_											
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280		4.32	4.10	3.92	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	743/1277		4.52	4.34	4.13	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	586/1269		4.54	4.31	4.04	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	3	0	Τ	3.50	****/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00		****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 79		4.67	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,		4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,		4.38	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	, -	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
5. 214 conferences merp jou carry out richa activities	10	Ü	J	_	5	5	J	2.00	, 51			1.50		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 672 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 673 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	4	2	1	2	2.58	1508/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	2.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	3	2		1419/1522		4.25	4.26	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	766/1285		4.32	4.30	4.22	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1198/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	1	2	2	2.58	1380/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	2.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1265/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1249/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1465/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1355/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	0	3		1375/1440			4.45	4.40	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	965/1448		4.71	4.71	4.63	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	2	3		1228/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	2	0	3		1382/1432		4.27	4.29	4.23	2.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1188/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	0	0	2		1187/1280			4.10	3.92	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277		4.52	4.34	4.13	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	671/1269		4.54	4.31	4.04	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	705/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228		****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216		****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79		4.67	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00			4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11 11	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 78 ****/ 80		4.38	4.45	3.88 3.79	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	TT	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 80		4.33	4.11	3.79	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -		****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1				****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23		****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22		****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 673 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Title Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18 Spring 2007

Page 674

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	c c		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«» «10» «10» «10» «10» «10» «10» «10» «														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1180/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	419/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	255/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	760/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	207/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	374/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1319/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	296/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.63
Lecture	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4 52	774/1440	4 00	4 20	4 45	4 40	4 52
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	-	0	1 0	1	3	12	4.53	774/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	-	-	0	3	14	4.82	710/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1		10	4.29	835/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2		11	4.41	745/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	564/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	468/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	299/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	477/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	407/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.12
- ,														
Laboratory	1 17	^	0	0	_	1	0	4 00	**** / O1F	****	****	1 26	4 21	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 228		****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****		4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216		****	4.42	4.41	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	***	****	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	1/	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 51			1.30	4.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	***	****	4.54	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M

21

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 674 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301

25

COMPOSITION

WALTERS, APRIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Page 675 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 6 7 1 3.47 1417/1522 3.83 4.17 4.30 4.14 3.47 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1. Did 1. Did 0. Did 1. Did
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 6 7 1 3.47 1417/1522 3.83 4.17 4.30 4.14 3.47 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 0 4 6 4 3.80 1244/1522 4.11 4.25 4.26 4.18 3.80 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 10 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 1065/1285 4.11 4.32 4.30 4.22 3.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 10 0 0 1 2 7 5 4.07 977/1476 4.28 4.37 4.22 4.09 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 4 2 4 3 1 2.64 1376/1412 3.84 4.13 4.06 4.01 2.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 4 8 4.20 663/1381 4.32 4.36 4.08 3.93 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 6 7 1 3.47 1417/1522 3.83 4.17 4.30 4.14 3.47 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 0 4 6 4 3.80 1244/1522 4.11 4.25 4.26 4.18 3.80 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 10 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 1065/1285 4.11 4.32 4.30 4.22 3.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 10 0 0 1 2 7 5 4.07 977/1476 4.28 4.37 4.22 4.09 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 4 2 4 3 1 2.64 1376/1412 3.84 4.13 4.06 4.01 2.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 4 8 4.20 663/1381 4.32 4.36 4.08 3.93 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 0 4 6 4 3.80 1244/1522 4.11 4.25 4.26 4.18 3.80 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 10 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 1065/1285 4.11 4.32 4.30 4.22 3.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 7 5 4.07 977/1476 4.28 4.37 4.22 4.09 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 4 2 4 3 1 2.64 1376/1412 3.84 4.13 4.06 4.01 2.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 4 8 4.20 663/1381 4.32 4.36 4.08 3.93 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 10 0 0 1 4 0 3.80 1065/1285 4.11 4.32 4.30 4.22 3.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 7 5 4.07 977/1476 4.28 4.37 4.22 4.09 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 4 2 4 3 1 2.64 1376/1412 3.84 4.13 4.06 4.01 2.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 4 8 4.20 663/1381 4.32 4.36 4.08 3.93 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 7 5 4.07 977/1476 4.28 4.37 4.22 4.09 4.07 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 4 2 4 3 1 2.64 1376/1412 3.84 4.13 4.06 4.01 2.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 4 8 4.20 663/1381 4.32 4.36 4.08 3.93 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 4 2 4 3 1 2.64 1376/1412 3.84 4.13 4.06 4.01 2.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 4 8 4.20 663/1381 4.32 4.36 4.08 3.93 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 4 8 4.20 663/1381 4.32 4.36 4.08 3.93 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 2 3 8 4.07 956/1500 4.16 4.10 4.18 4.16 4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1 0 3 9 1 3.64 1215/1497 4.13 4.22 4.11 4.02 3.64
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 1 6 6 4.21 1079/1440 4.22 4.32 4.45 4.40 4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 1157/1448 4.63 4.71 4.71 4.63 4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 4 5 5 4.07 1018/1436 4.18 4.31 4.29 4.24 4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0 3 5 5 3.93 1108/1432 4.11 4.27 4.29 4.23 3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 0 2 4 4 2 3.50 899/1221 3.82 3.73 3.93 3.86 3.50
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 657/1280 4.07 4.32 4.10 3.92 4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 272/1277 4.40 4.52 4.34 4.13 4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 420/1269 4.43 4.54 4.31 4.04 4.71
4. Were special techniques successful 9 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 569/854 3.73 4.05 4.02 3.87 3.80
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 6
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 4 D 0
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough
P 0 responses to be significant
I 0 Other 5
? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401

23

COMPOSITION

ROCKETT, DANIKA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Page 676 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	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	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	4	0	0	0	5	6	1	3.67	1338/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.67
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	5	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1032/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.09
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	kpected goals	4	5	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	745/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.29
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	860/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.20
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	892/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.91
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	482/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.36
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	275/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.70
8. How max	ny times	was class cance	elled		5	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1307/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.18
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	820/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.11
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	he instri	actor's lecture		orepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4 27	1031/1440	4 22	4.32	4 45	4.40	4.27
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	1	2	8		1036/1448		4.71		4.63	4.64
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl				5	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	942/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	4.18
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	869/1432		4.27	4.29	4.23	4.27
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				5 5	1	0	0	1	6	3		500/1221		3.73			4.20
			2															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	859/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.83
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1094/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.67
				d open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	828/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.17
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		10	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	426/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.00
				Freq	1encs	, Die	tri b	1+ i 01	า									
				rieqi	<i>aency</i>	DIS	CLID	20101	.1									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 5 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					Re	auir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		-	5_ 5.5.5.00	-	-) ~		=
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0				El	ecti	ves			0 #### - Means there are not enough				ŗh					
P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
I 0					Ot1	her					4	_						
				? 0														

University of Maryland Page 677
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501

17

COMPOSITION

KILLGALLON, DON

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Questions 						NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain nev	w insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	814/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.33
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	904/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.22
		estions reflec	_	_	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	425/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.56
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	908/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.89
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	519/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.33
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	435/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.56
8. How ma	any times v	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	782/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.14
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.78
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.89
3. Was le	ecture mate	erial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.78
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	984/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.11
5. Did av	udiovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	408/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.33
	Discussion																	
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							1	1	3	4	4.11	677/1280		4.32	4.10	3.92	4.11
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277		4.52	4.34	4.13	4.89
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	721/1269		4.54	4.31	4.04	4.33
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succe	ssful		0	2	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	816/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	2.86
		Labora	-															
2. Were y	you provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	assigned to	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	***
2. Was th	ne instruct	tor available	for ind:	ividual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did re	esearch pro	ojects contrib	ute to v	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did pr	resentation	ns contribute	to what	you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	***
5. Were o	criteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	ield exper	ience contribu	te to wh	nat you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
Fre							trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades	des Reasons								Ту	ре			Majors	}			
	00-27 2 0.00-0.00 0 7 5																	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	5	6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
						~						0	1	,	•			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0						Gei	nera.	L				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	9
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0										0 #### - Means there are not enough				1-				
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - respons				_	ın
	I 0		Otl	her					2	-								

? 0

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601 University of Maryland Page 678
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 21

Ο	uestionnaires:	17	St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

						Fre	equer	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	_			_			_		_							
	n new insights,ski			0	0	1	0	1	10	5		1088/1522		4.17	4.30	4.14	4.06
	structor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	522/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.53
	m questions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.80
	evaluations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	275/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.71
	ed readings contrib			0	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	760/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00
	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	495/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.35
7. Was the gra	ding system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	406/1500		4.10	4.18	4.16	4.59
8. How many ti	mes was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1246/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.29
9. How would y	ou grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	433/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.47
	Lectur							_	_			==0.4440					
	structor's lecture			0	0	0	0	Τ	3	13	4.71	552/1440		4.32	4.45	4.40	4.71
	structor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	710/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82
	material presente			0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	576/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	4.53
	ctures contribute t		-	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	611/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.53
5. Did audiovi	sual techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	394/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.35
1 12 - 1	Discus			0	0	0	0	1	2	1 2	4 71	261/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	2 00	4 71
	liscussions contrib		-	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	13	4.71	. ,				3.92	4.71
	udents actively en	_		0	0	0	0	0	3	14		299/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.82
	structor encourage		nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	244/1269		4.54		4.04	4.88
4. Were specia	al techniques succe	ssiul		0	6	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	369/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.18
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	l Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
			- 										- 				
00-27 5	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	4	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 3	1.00-1.99	1	в 7														
56-83 1	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	0	D 0														
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t		re not	enoug	ſh

Other

responses to be significant

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 679 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	919/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	511/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	444/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	973/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	187/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	940/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	10	0	3.91	1450/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	898/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	877/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	758/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	408/1221		3.73	3.93	3.86	4.33
3. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	5	2	U	1	U	_	7	4.33	400/1221	3.02	3.73	3.93	3.00	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	357/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	347/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 205	***	****	4.23	4.28	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52		****
								5.00	•	****			4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12 12	0	0	0	0	0 1	1		****/ 65 ****/ 78	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	****/ 80		4.33	4.11	3.79	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	***	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	14	U	J	J	J	_	U	1.00	/ 10			1.79	1.11	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701

Title COMPOSITION SCHMIDT, VIRGIN Instructor:

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13 Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN

16

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 679 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate 0	0 Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad 13	3 Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	here are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	1			
				?	0					

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1801

10

COMPOSITION

WALTERS, APRIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Page 680 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies	5			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		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	_	this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1269/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.80
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	1		1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00
		uestions reflect	_	_	0	3	0	1	0	1	0		1248/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.00
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	473/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.50
				what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1367/1412		4.13	4.06	4.01	2.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	663/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.20
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	630/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.40
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1301/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.20
				ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.50
		Lecture	-															
1 Wome +	ho inata	actor's lecture:		boxonowad	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	984/1440	1 22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.33
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	4.63	4.71	4.45	4.63	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	2		1056/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	4.00
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	2	1		1036/1430		4.27	4.29	4.23	4.00
			_	our understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/1221			3.93	3.86	****
J. Did ad	alovisua	r ceciniiques em	lance yo	our understanding	1	3	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 1221	3.02	3.73	3.93	3.00	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1150/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.20
				l to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	849/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.20
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	671/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.40
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		0	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	588/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.75
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
G	1	Charm CDA		The same of Consider				Д-		_			m				Ma	
Credits E	.arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке	asons	; -			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 15 Spring 2007

Page 681

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank			Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																	
1 Did von	ı gəin ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	889/152	2 3.	3 3	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.27
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	432/152			4.25	4.26	4.14	4.60
		estions reflec			0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/128			4.32	4.30	4.22	4.80
	_	ations reflect			0	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	629/147			4.37	4.22	4.09	4.40
				what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87				4.13	4.06	4.01	3.87
				o what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	207/138			4.36	4.08	3.93	4.67
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	630/150			4.10	4.18	4.16	4.40
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93				4.47	4.65	4.62	4.93
	_			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57				4.22	4.11	4.02	4.57
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	392/144	0 4.	22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.79
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/144	8 4.	53	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.71
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	357/143	6 4.	18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.71
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	478/143	2 4.	11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.64
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/122	1 3.	32	3.73	3.93	3.86	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	267/128	0 4.	7	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.70
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/127	7 4.	10	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.90
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/126	9 4.	13	4.54	4.31	4.04	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	194/ 85	4 3.	73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.50
		Semina	_																
				announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	0		, .	9 **		4.67	4.58	4.13	****
				lividual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	7 **		4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did res	search pi	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	5 **	* *	4.75	4.49	3.85	***
		Self					_		_	_									
	_	-		what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	7 **		****	4.63	4.53	****
		cions make clea			14	0	0	0	0	0	1					****	4.41	4.19	****
_		acts with the i		_	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	3 **		****	4.69	4.57	****
		ck/tutoring by		_	14	0	0	0	0	1	0 1		, -	8 **		****	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were tr	nere enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	ne students	14	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	^^^^/ 1	.8 ^^	• •		4.49	4.11	* * * *
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Г	'уре				Majors	\$
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A 11		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	6	Gradua	te		 0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 2													-		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-	grad	1	5	Non-	-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0						enoug	jh
				P 0									respon	ses to	b b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
						0.1	•												

Other

I

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001

24

COMPOSITION

WILKINSON, RACH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Page 682 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

O L	a	The and I have be declared	Ouestionnaire	
Scudent	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescrommarre	

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did vou	u gain ne	w insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	1190/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.94
		tor make clear			1	0	2	0	3	1	9	4.00	1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00
		estions reflect			0	11	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1142/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.60
		ations reflect			0	1	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	535/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.47
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ıte to w	hat you learned	0	1	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	852/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.93
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0 6	1	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	434/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.40
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	z explai	ned	0	1	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	988/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	1	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	1054/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.53
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	5 6	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	718/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.20
		T	_															
1 Wara +h	ho inatru	Lecture ctor's lectures		ropared	1	0	2	0	1	2	10	4 20	1094/1440	1 22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.20
		tor seem inter			1	0	1	0	2	2	10		1271/1448		4.71	4.45	4.40	4.20
				plained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	_	10	4.13	980/1436		4.31		4.24	4.13
		s contribute to			1	2	0	0	2	2	9		600/1430		4.27		4.23	4.54
			_	our understanding	2	2	2	0	1	3	-	3.92						3.92
J. DIG auc	alovisuai	teciniiques em	lalice yo	di diderstanding	4	۷	2	U		3	0	3.94	000/1221	3.02	3.73	3.93	3.00	3.94
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	5	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	687/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.09
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	l to participate	5	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	855/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.18
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	855/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.09
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		6	1	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	625/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.67
				Fred	quency	, Dia	tri b	1+101	2									
				1160	<u> 1</u> uerre y	DIS	CLID	20101	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	asons	3			Ty	рe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		110	9422	Ju		.,	~	•	OZ dadao	_	Ü			-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								-			-		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5	-		5			
				? 1														
						00.						5						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 683

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24			_		
Questionnaires:	8	Student	Course	Eval	luation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2101

COMPOSITION

MCGURRIN JR, AN

Title

Instructor:

					Fre	-ane	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
	General			_	_		_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new ins	-		1	0	0	0	2	3	2		1122/1522				4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor r		_	1	0	1	0	3	2	1		1432/1522		4.25	4.26	4.18	3.29
3. Did the exam question			1	4	0	1	0	0	2		938/1285		4.32	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluation		1 3	1	0	0	1	3	1	2		1293/1476		4.37	4.22	4.09	3.57
Did assigned reading	•	_	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	760/1412		4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignme		-	1	0	0	0	2	1	4		575/1381		4.36	4.08	3.93	4.29
Was the grading syst	tem clearly expl	ained	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1236/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.67
8. How many times was	class cancelled		1	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1495/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.43
9. How would you grade	the overall tea	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1147/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.75
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor	's lectures well	prepared	2	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1385/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.33
2. Did the instructor	seem interested	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1271/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.33
3. Was lecture material	l presented and	explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1282/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.50
4. Did the lectures con	ntribute to what	you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1320/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.33
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussion		what you learned	5	0	0	Ο	1	1	1	4.00	718/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students as		-	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1277		4.52		4.13	4.33
3. Did the instructor	1 3		5	0	0	0	1	1	1		875/1269		4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00
4. Were special technic	-	na open arbeablion	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	779/ 854				3.87	3.00
-				- -												
		Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	ribi	11101	n									
Credits Farned	Cum GDA	Expected Grades				Po:	agons	2			Тъл	ne			Maiore	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101

25

COMPOSITION

DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2007

Page 684

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	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 vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	-	m this course	0	0	0	0	Λ	6	13	4.68	414/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.68
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	465/1522	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.58
		estions reflec			0	11	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.88
		ations reflect			0	0	1	1	0	6	11	4.32	724/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.32
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	149/1412	4.15	4.13	4.22	4.03	4.79
	-	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.79	272/1381	4.13	4.13	4.08	3.93	4.79
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	,	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.37
		was class canc		illed	0	0	0	0	2	14	3		1372/1517		4.10	4.10	4.10	4.05
				1-1		0	0	0	0				- , -	4.35				
9. HOW WO	ula you g	grade the overa	.ii tead	hing effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	3	13	4.81	142/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.81
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	208/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.89
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	326/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.74
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	97/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.95
				our understanding	0	7	3	3	1	1	4		1064/1221	3.14	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.00
		1000			-		-	-	_	_	_							
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	199/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.79
		_	_	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	421/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.71
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	351/1269	4.44	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.79
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	2	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	588/ 854	3.82	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.75
		Labora	tory															
1 Did th	e lah ind	rease understa		of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
				ground information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
				or lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
		structor provid			18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
				early specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 205	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
J. NOIG I	04411011101	100 101 100 105	0105 01			-	Ü	Ü	Ū	Ü	_	3.00	, 200			1.23	1.20	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	auir	ed fo	 or M	aior	s 1	2	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 8		100	-1 WTT (- L	J. 1.11	<u>ـ ۲</u>	~ 1	-	Gradact	_	~	11000	-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		061	с.а.	_					onaci -g.	Luu 1	- /	14011		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		רום.	ecti	17AC				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	3	P 0		DT6	-CLI	veb				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					2	respons	es co L	e sign	ıııcaı.	16	
				Ι 0		UCI	uer.					4						

? 0

University of Maryland Page 685
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201

25

COMPOSITION

BROFMAN, MARGAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

									_	ncie	s .			tructor		_	UMBC		Sect
		Questions	5		N	R	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course		0	0	2	3	6	6	3	3.25	1464/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.25
		tor make clear				0	0	1	4	3	7	5		1344/1522	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.55
		estions reflect	_	-		0	6	1	1	5	3	4		1147/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.57
	_	ations reflect				0	1	2	1	4	8	4		1293/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.58
		adings contrib				2	1	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	1154/1412		4.13	4.06	4.01	3.53
		signments contr				2	0	1	1	6	5	5		1097/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	3.67
		system clearly				1	0	1	1	2	10	5	3.89	1093/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.89
		was class cance				1	0	1	0	0	11	7	4.21	1289/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.21
		grade the overa		ning effectiven	ess	3	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1246/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.59
		Lecture				_		_	_	_	_	_							
		ctor's lectures				1	0	2	1	5	6	5		1349/1440		4.32		4.40	3.58
		tor seem inter		-		1	0	1	0	2	8			1329/1448		4.71		4.63	4.16
		erial presented			-	2	0	1	3 0	5	6			1320/1436		4.31	4.29	4.24	3.39
		es contribute to	_			2	0	4	•	3	7			1309/1432		4.27	4.29	4.23	3.39
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understand:	ng	5	12	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1221	3.14	3.73	3.93	3.86	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib		what you learne	d	9	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	927/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.73
		its actively end		-			0	1	2	0	5	2		1136/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.50
		tor encourage					0	1	0	3	3	3		1059/1269	4.44	4.54	4.31	4.04	3.70
		chniques succes		copon dibodbi	1		4	1	0	1	2	_	3.40	705/ 854			4.02		3.40
	-	-																	
				F	requen	су	Dist	cribu	ıtio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	des				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 6			Rec	 guire	d f	or Ma	ajors	 s 1	.3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9							J						5 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1			Ger	neral					0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0										J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0			Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	уh
				P 0										respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
														_		_			
				I 0			Oth	ıer					6						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301 Title COMPOSITION

University of Maryland Baltimore County Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I. Spring 2007

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 686 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain n	new insights, skills from	this course	0	0	0	3	1	10	9	4.09	1067/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.09
	actor make clear the expe		0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	592/1522		4.25	4.26	4.18	4.48
	questions reflect the exp		0	17	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	531/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other eval	uations reflect the expe	ected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	582/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.43
5. Did assigned r	readings contribute to w	nat you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	402/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.43
6. Did written as	signments contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	10	11	4.35	507/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.35
7. Was the gradin	ng system clearly explain	ned	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	585/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.43
8. How many times	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	911/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.68
9. How would you	grade the overall teach:	ing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	592/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.32
	Lecture															
1. Were the instr	ructor's lectures well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	512/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.73
	ctor seem interested in	_	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	494/1448		4.71	4.71	4.63	4.91
	terial presented and exp	-	1	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55			4.31	4.29	4.24	4.55
	res contribute to what yo	_	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	632/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.50
	al techniques enhance you		1	14	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1011/1221		3.73	3.93	3.86	3.25
	Discussion															
1. Did class disc	cussions contribute to w	nat vou learned	2	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	492/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.38
	ents actively encouraged	_	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76			4.52	4.34		4.76
	ctor encourage fair and	open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	223/1269		4.54	4.31	4.04	4.90
4. Were special t	echniques successful		2	3	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	407/ 854	3.82	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.11
	Laboratory															
2. Were you provi	ded with adequate backg:	round information	20	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
4. Did the lab in	structor provide assista	ance	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned	topics relevant to the a	announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****
_	actor available for indi		20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	***	4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research p	projects contribute to w	nat you learned	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****
_	ons contribute to what	_	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****
=	for grading made clear		20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	***	4.33	4.11		****
	Field Work															
1. Did field expe	erience contribute to what	at you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	***
2. Did you clearl	y understand your evalua	ation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced	l system contribute to w	nat you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
		Enom		. Dia	+ w i bı		•									
		Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	utioi	:1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 8	0.00-0.99 0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 3	1.00-1.99 0	в 14			-			-						,		
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 3	C 3		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	23
84-150 0	3.00-3.49 6	D 0														
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	t enoug	jh
		P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nifican	nt	
		I 0		Ot]	her					9						

? 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401

27

COMPOSITION

SCHMIDT, VIRGIN

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

Page 687 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	Ο	3	4	8	4	3 68	1329/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	1053/1522		4.25	4.26	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	787/1285		4.32	4.30	4.22	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	903/1476		4.37	4.22	4.09	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	760/1412		4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	361/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	6	2	8	3.68	1227/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	15	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	898/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	***

Frequency Distribution

19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1277 4.34 4.52 4.34 4.13 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601 University of Maryland Page 688 JUN 26, 2007 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON Enrollment: 21

Ouestionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionna

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	707/1522		4.17	4.30	4.14	4.43
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	670/1522		4.25	4.26	4.18	4.43
	_	uestions reflec		_	0	3	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	887/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.09
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	406/1476		4.37	4.22	4.09	4.57
				what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	,		4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	-,		4.36	4.08	3.93	4.62
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	2	2	1	9	4.21	,		4.10	4.18	4.16	4.21
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	749/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.79
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	thing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	718/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.20
		Lectur	-															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	716/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.57
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.71
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	601/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.50
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	632/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	2	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1033/1221	3.14	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.18
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	1	7	3.69	945/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.69
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	706/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.38
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	685/1269	4.44	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.38
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	1	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	426/ 854	3.82	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding c	of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
				Frequ	ıency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
						·								- 				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 5 B 5		Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	ıjor	S	4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	_ ~		~		,				0	77 A		4	37		1.4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								0			1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Εle	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	lu
				P 0		0.1						-	respons	es to b	e sign	niican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					7						
			? 0															

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101 University of Maryland Page 689 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN JUN 26, 2007 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

17

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	2	5	4 00	1122/1522	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	833/1285	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	871/1476	4.18	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	892/1412	3.91	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	482/1381	4.36	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	924/1500	4.11	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	782/1497	4.14	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	751/1440	4.55	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1123/1448	4.55	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	869/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	670/1280	4.13	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	891/1277	4.13	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	Τ	2	0	2	3.17	756/ 854	3.17	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 210A 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE Enrollment: 48

Questionnaires: 41

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 690

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor		Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	.k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	m this course	1	0	1	0	7	19	13	4 07	1074/1	522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.07
		ctor make clear the ex		1	0	0	1	10	11	18	4.15	976/1		4.15	4.25	4.26		4.15
		uestions reflect the e		1	0	0	2	2	13	23	4.43			4.43		4.30		4.43
	_	uations reflect the ex	_	1	1	1	0	3	18	17	4.28	758/1		4.28	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.28
		eadings contribute to		1	0	0	0	0	6			119/1		4.85	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.85
		signments contribute t		1	0	0	0	5	15			470/1		4.38	4.36	4.08		4.38
		g system clearly expla		1	0	1						1219/1		3.70	4.10	4.18		3.70
		was class cancelled	21104	1	0	1	5	24	8	2		1503/1		3.13	4.47			
		grade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6				794/1						
		Lecture																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	5	0	1	0	4	14	17	4.28	1031/1	440	4.28	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.28
		ctor seem interested i		6	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77			4.77				4.77
		terial presented and e		6	0	0	1	2	14	18	4.40	720/1	436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.40
		es contribute to what	-	5	1	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	466/1	432	4.66	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.66
		l techniques enhance y		7	6	0	0	10	11	7	3.89	701/1	221	3.89	3.73	3.93	4.02	3.89
		Discussion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute to	what vou learned	23	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	317/1	280	4.61	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.61
		nts actively encourage	_	23	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	517/1	277	4.61	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.61
		ctor encourage fair an		23	0	0	0	1	1		4.83			4.83			4.33	4.83
		echniques successful		23	3	0	0	2	7		4.27						4.00	
		Laboratory																
1. Did th	he lab ind	crease understanding o	f the material	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequate back	ground information	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
_		materials available f	_	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
		Seminar																
3. Did re	esearch p	rojects contribute to	what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utic	n										
Credits H	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Re	ason	s				Тур	oe.			Majors	.
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.5	Grad	uate	9	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	В 14		_		_							, .				
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 1	C 3		Gei	nera	Τ				4	Unde	r-gı	rad 4	11	Non-	-major	39
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 11	D 0											_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0		EΙθ	ecti	ves				2						enoug	ın
			P 1		0.1					_	-	resp	onse	es to b	oe sign	niticar	nt	
			I 0		Otl	ner				1	.5							
			? 2															

Course-Section: ENGL 210B 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Instructor: SCALIA, BILL Spring 2007

Page 691 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies				tructor	Course	_			
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	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	919/1522	4.24	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	8	6		1016/1522	4.12	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	690/1285	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	815/1476	4.24	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	61/1412	4.94	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	2	4	11		314/1381	4.53	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	1048/1500	3.94	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	705/1440	4.59	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	436/1436	4.65	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	187/1432	4.88	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	692/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.00	****
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	s	8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 7			-			-						3 -		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 3		Ge	nera	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	19
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0									3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
I 0									_					
		Ot]	her					5						

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101

ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE

Title

Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 692 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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	2	0	0	2	6	7	6		1269/1522		4.17	4.30	4.34	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	976/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	,	4.94	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	519/1476		4.37	4.22	4.20	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	2	9	6		1037/1412	3.73	4.13	4.06	4.00	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	938/1381	3.90	4.36	4.08	3.97	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	5	4	7		1315/1500	3.48	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	7	12	1		1487/1517	3.57	4.47	4.65	4.63	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	10	Τ	3.56	1258/1497	3.56	4.22	4.11	4.11	3.56
Tanhiina														
Lecture	1	0	1	0	5	11	_	2 06	1266/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.42	3.86
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1 1	0	0	0	0	10	5 12					4.45	4.42	4.55
	1	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	1123/1448 906/1436	4.55	4.71	4.71		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0		1	2	4		4.23		4.23 4.32	4.31 4.27	4.29	4.29 4.31	4.23 4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1 1	0	0	3	4	4.13	556/1221	4.13	3.73	3.93	4.02	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	Τ	U	U	3	4	4.13	550/1221	4.13	3./3	3.93	4.02	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	839/1280	3.88	4.32	4.10	4.08	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	756/ 854		4.05	4.02	4.00	3.17
1. Note special committee successful		_	_	Ū	_	_	_	3.1.	7507 051	3.17	1.05	1.02	1.00	3.1.
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.30	4.58	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
0-36 7 3														
Self Paced	0.0	0	0	0	_	•	-	- 00	25	als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 60	als als als als	de de de de
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	***	****	4.63	***	* * * *
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	***	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	***	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	^ ^ * *	4.49	^ ^ * *	^ ^ * *

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101

Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE

Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 692 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reas			Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101

Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI

Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL

Enrollment: 36

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 693 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	744/1522	4.39	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	12	4.35	698/1285	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	519/1476	4.47	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	305/1412	4.57	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	633/1381	4.23	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	630/1500	4.41	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	8	4.35	1209/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	469/1497	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	656/1440		4.32	4.45	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	838/1432		4.27	4.29	4.31	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	13	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	485/1269	4.64	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	***	****

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101

Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI

Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 693 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	Type			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101

Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 30

Page 694 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

			Fre	eque	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	0	0	1.0	4	1 -	4.17	000/1500	1 17	4.17	4.30	4.34	1 17
	1 1	0	0	0	10 3	4 12	15 14	4.17	980/1522 738/1522	4.17 4.38	4.17	4.26	4.34	4.17 4.38
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	1	3	0	0	3	10	13	4.38	666/1285		4.25	4.20	4.29	4.38
-		0	0	0	2									
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	14 4	13	4.38	660/1476	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.38 4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2 2	0	0	0	3	6	22 19	4.71 4.57	191/1412	4.71 4.57	4.13 4.36	4.06	4.00 3.97	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.57	272/1381	4.57			4.20	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	22	1 / 6		541/1500 1289/1517		4.10 4.47	4.18 4.65	4.63	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.21	695/1497		4.47	4.11	4.03	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	U	U	۷	14	,	4.22	095/1497	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	617/1440	4.65	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	436/1436	4.64	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	2	1	3	4	8	3.83	739/1221	3.83	3.73	3.93	4.02	3.83
_,														
Discussion	1.4	0	•	-	-	_	0	4 20	400/1000	4 20	4 20	4 10	4 00	4 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	499/1280	4.38	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	773/1277	4.29	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****
Seminar				_		_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
Self Paced					_									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -	****	****	4.63	***	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	***	****	4.49	****	***

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101

Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Instructor:

BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment:

43 Questionnaires: 30 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 694 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Re				Reasons Type					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	30	Non-major	28	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there		e are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	10					
				?	0							

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101

Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE

ITCLE INTRO TO SHARESFE

Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Page 695 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	3	17	4.27	889/1522	4.27	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	10	13	4.31	824/1522	4.31	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	9	13	4.23	780/1285	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	12	4.08	971/1476	4.08	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	19	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	12	4.04	790/1381	4.04	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	650/1500	4.38	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	4.38	1177/1517	4.38	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	481/1497	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	18	4.58	705/1440	4.58	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	6		4.57	527/1436	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	17	4.46	695/1432		4.27	4.29	4.31	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	0	6	3		3.31	991/1221			3.93		3.31
5. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	2	0	3	U	O	3	4	3.31	991/1221	3.31	3.73	3.93	4.02	3.31
Discussion	_		_	_	_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	2	3	11	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	3	9	3.95	979/1277	3.95	4.52	4.34	4.33	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	699/1269	4.37	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	3	0	1	6	5	3.67	625/ 854	3.67	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
5. Did conterences help you carry out field activities	∠5	U	U	Т	U	U	U	2.00	***/ 34	****	***	4.30	4.1/	
Self Paced	0.5		0	-	0	•	0	0.00	****	ale ale ale a	4.4.4.2	4 60	ate ate ate at	ate ate ate at
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	U	2.00	,	***	****	4.63	***	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 23	***	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	***	****	4.69	***	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101

Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE

Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 695 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

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

Baltimore County
Spring 2007

Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 21 Page 696 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n n n n n

	-						Inst	-		Dept	t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	482/1522	4.62	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.36	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	9	4	5	3.60	1112/1412	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.00	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	162/1381	4.74	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1321/1500	3.46	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	244/1517	4.95	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.95
$9.\ \mbox{How would}$ you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	744/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	728/1440	4.56	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	684/1436	4.44	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.4
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	884/1432	4.25	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.2
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	4.02	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	214/1280	4.76	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.7
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.8
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	410/1269	4.72	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.40
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	i	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101

Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR

Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 697 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluati	on Questionnaire
-------------------------	------------------

4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 1 0 1 2 5 4.11 945/1476 4.11 4.37 4.22 4.20 4.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 2 2 5 3.73 1037/1412 3.73 4.13 4.06 4.00 3.73 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 1 1 6 3.91 938/1381 3.91 4.36 4.08 3.97 3.91 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 2 1 2 1 4 3.40 1357/1500 3.40 4.10 4.18 4.20 3.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.47 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1277/1497 3.50 4.22 4.11 4.11 3.50 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20 1.2				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned regarding system clearly explained 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 1 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1420 3.36 4.32 4.30 4.36 4.31 4.35 4.36 4.31 4.36 4.30 4.30 4.31 4.35 4.30 4.30 4.31 4.35 4.30 4.30 4.31 4.35 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned regarding system clearly explained 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 1 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1420 3.36 4.32 4.30 4.36 4.31 4.35 4.36 4.31 4.36 4.30 4.30 4.31 4.35 4.30 4.30 4.31 4.35 4.30 4.30 4.31 4.35 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 1 1 2 5 3.64 1313/1522 3.64 4.25 4.26 4.29 3.64 3.0 bid the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 204/1285 4.83 4.32 4.30 4.36 4.83 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 1 0 1 2 5 4.11 945/1476 4.11 4.37 4.22 4.20 4.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 2 2 5 3.73 1037/1412 3.73 4.13 4.06 4.08 3.97 3.91 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 3 1 1 6 3.91 938/1381 3.91 4.36 4.08 3.97 3.91 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 2 1 2 1 4 3.40 1357/1500 3.40 4.10 4.18 4.20 3.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.47 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1277/1497 3.50 4.22 4.11 4.11 3.50 7. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1440 3.36 4.32 4.45 4.42 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 1123/1448 4.55 4.71 4.71 4.78 4.55 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 4.32 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals				_	-			_							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		0						_							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 2 2 5 3.73 1037/1412 3.73 4.13 4.06 4.00 3.73 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 1 1 6 3.91 938/1381 3.91 4.36 4.08 3.97 3.91 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 2 1 2 1 4 3.40 1357/150 3.40 4.10 4.18 4.20 3.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.47 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1277/1497 3.50 4.22 4.11 4.11 3.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1440 3.36 4.32 4.45 4.42 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 1123/1448 4.55 4.71 4.71 4.78 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.64 1251/1436 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.31 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 586/1280 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.35 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.35 4. Were special techniques understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** 4.35 4.56 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** 4.35 4.56 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 **** 4.30 4.05 ***** 4.3								_							4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 1 1 1 6 3.91 938/1381 3.91 4.36 4.08 3.97 3.91 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 2 1 2 1 4 3.40 1357/1500 3.40 4.10 4.18 4.20 3.40 9. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.47 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1277/1497 3.50 4.22 4.11 4.11 3.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1440 3.36 4.32 4.45 4.42 3.36 138 1.44 1.45 4.55 1.25 1.25 1.25 1.25 1.25 1.25 1.25 1	<u> </u>	0		_	-	_		_	4.11	945/1476		4.37	4.22	4.20	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 2 1 2 1 4 3.40 1357/1500 3.40 4.10 4.18 4.20 3.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.47 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1277/1497 3.50 4.22 4.11 4.11 3.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1440 3.36 4.32 4.45 4.42 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 1123/1448 4.55 4.71 4.71 4.78 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.64 1251/1436 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.26 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.32 4.31 4.33 4.35 4.35 1.30 1 1 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.34 4.31 4.33 4.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1.35 1			-					5	3.73						3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.47 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1277/1497 3.50 4.22 4.11 4.11 3.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1440 3.36 4.32 4.45 4.42 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 1123/1448 4.55 4.71 4.71 4.78 4.78 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.64 1251/1436 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.31 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.35 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.45 4.72 ****		0	0	-	3		1	6	3.91	938/1381	3.91	4.36	4.08	3.97	3.91
Lecture Lect		0	1			2	1	4	3.40	1357/1500	3.40	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.40
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10. Did the lab instructor yrovide assistance							0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.47	4.65	4.63	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1440 3.36 4.32 4.45 4.42 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 0 2 8 4.55 1123/1448 4.55 4.71 4.71 4.78 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.64 1251/1436 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.31 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 4.20 4.05 4.06 **** 4.20 4.05 4.25 4.35 4.56 4.42 4.72 **** 4.20 4.25 4.26 4.37 4.27 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.22	4.11	4.11	3.50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 2 1 3 1 4 3.36 1381/1440 3.36 4.32 4.45 4.42 3.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 0 2 8 4.55 1123/1448 4.55 4.71 4.71 4.78 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.64 1251/1436 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.31 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 4.20 4.05 4.06 **** 4.20 4.05 4.25 4.35 4.56 4.42 4.72 **** 4.20 4.25 4.26 4.37 4.27 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 1123/1448 4.55 4.71 4.71 4.78 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.64 1251/1436 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.31 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 4.00 4.20 4.00 4.20 4.00 4.20 4.00 4.20 4.00 4.20 4.2		0	0	2	1	3	1	4	3.36	1381/1440	3.36	4.32	4.45	4.42	3.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 3 2 4 3.64 1251/1436 3.64 4.31 4.29 4.29 3.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.31 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 4.00 4.20 4.00 4.00 4.00			0			0		8		,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 3 0 2 5 3.64 1233/1432 3.64 4.27 4.29 4.31 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5 1 0 0 1 3 4.00 606/1221 4.00 3.73 3.93 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 ***** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****								4							
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****								_							
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 1 0 6 4.25 585/1280 4.25 4.32 4.10 4.08 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****	5. Dia additivibadi tetimiqueb elimante jour anderbeanding	-	3	_	Ü	Ü	_	3	1.00	000/1221	1.00	3.73	3.75	1.02	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 0 6 4.25 804/1277 4.25 4.52 4.34 4.33 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.38 692/1269 4.38 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 2 0 3 4.20 363/854 4.20 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.20 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	585/1280	4.25	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.25
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	0	6	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.25
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	692/1269	4.38	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.38
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****			2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.20
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.36 4.62 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****		1.0	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 215	****	****	4 36	4 62	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** **** 4.51 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****	9						-	1		,		****			
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 216 **** **** 4.42 4.72 ****								_		,		****			
							-	_							
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 """/ 205 """ 4.23 4.37 """							-	_		,					
	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 205			4.23	4.37	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you realned for the first of the first fi							-	-		, 1,	****	****			****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.58 ****	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	***
Self Paced	Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 **** ****	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** ****			0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
		10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****
								0		,	****	****		****	****
							0	0	2.00		****	****		***	****
Frequency Distribution	Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	1									

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

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 21

Page 698 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

	Questions						Fre	equei		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 y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	1012/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.14
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	670/1522	3.84	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.43
		uestions reflec			1	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1285	4.20	4.32	4.30	4.36	****
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	682/1476	4.03	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.35
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	566/1412	4.04	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.25
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	331/1381	4.38	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.50
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	935/1500	3.39	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.10
8. How m	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1161/1517	4.60	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.40
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	898/1497	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.00
		Lectur																
1 Were	the instr	uctor's lecture		nrenared	a	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	705/1440	3.82	4.32	4 45	4.42	4.58
			٥	0	0	0	0	2	-	4.83	683/1448			4.71	4.78	4.83		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	1	0	2	9		502/1436		4.31		4.29	4.58
		es contribute t			9 9	0	0	0	1	3	-	4.58	548/1432				4.31	4.58
				our understanding	9	9	0	0	0	2	1		****/1221				4.02	****
3. <u>21</u> a a	441071244	i ccomingaco	ilalioc j	our unacrocanariig			ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	_	1.55	, 1221	1.00	3.73	3.75	1.02	
		Discus				_				_								
				what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	5	10		468/1280			4.10	4.08	4.41
		_	_	d to participate	4	0	0		1		13	4.59	540/1277		4.52	4.34	4.33	4.59
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	1		13	4.71			4.54	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssiul		4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	125/ 854	4.34	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.71
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27							quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В 9														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0											_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

8

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201 University of Maryland Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 17

Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Page 699

JUN 26, 2007

				- que.		_			21 40 001	004100	DOPO	01.20		5000
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	0	3	5	7	4.06	1081/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	945/1522	3.84	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	809/1285	4.20	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	535/1476	4.03	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	493/1412	4.04	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	434/1381	4.38	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	913/1500	3.39	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	911/1517	4.60	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	385/1497	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	961/1440	3.82	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.90	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	762/1436	3.95	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	995/1432	4.03	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1221	1.86	3.73	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	459/1280	4.42	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.63	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	836/1269	4.54	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.34	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

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

INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY Baltimore County
MABE, MITZI J Spring 2007

I 0

?

1

Enrollment: 24

Instructor:

Questionnaires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	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 n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	4	5	6	6	3.67	1338/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.67
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	2	5	9	3	2	2.90	1494/1522		4.25	4.26	4.29	2.90
		uestions reflec		_	0	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1285	4.20	4.32	4.30	4.36	***
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	2	1	5	3	6	3	3.28	1376/1476	4.03	4.37	4.22	4.20	3.28
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	7	6	3.52	1154/1412	4.04	4.13	4.06	4.00	3.52
				o what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	623/1381	4.38	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.24
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	2	9	5	2	3	0	1.95	1491/1500	3.39	4.10	4.18	4.20	1.95
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	873/1517	4.60	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.71
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	8	8	2	3.58	1250/1497	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.11	3.58
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	3	0	5	3	6	4	0	2.50	1428/1440	3.82	4.32	4.45	4.42	2.50
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	- ,		4.71	4.71	4.78	4.95
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	2	4	8	4	1		1400/1436		4.31	4.29	4.29	2.89
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	4	5	4	5	3.42	1298/1432	4.03	4.27	4.29	4.31	3.42
				our understanding	4	10	4	0	3	0	0	1.86	1206/1221	1.86	3.73	3.93	4.02	1.86
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	ace diec			what you learned	Δ	0	0	2	0	4	11	4.41	468/1280	4.42	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.41
				ed to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	540/1277		4.52	4.34	4.33	4.59
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76			4.54	4.31	4.33	4.76
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	4	1	2	0	3	5	6	3.81	- ,		4.05	4.02	4.00	3.81
				Frequ	02001	. Dia	- wib	.+ : 0.	-									
				rrequ	ency	DIS	LIID	10101	1									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						 guire	ed fo	or Ma	aior	`s	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	8
28-55	28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 10									. ,		-		-	-) ~		-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Gei	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	13
84-150	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 5 D 0																-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - 1				_	h
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt		

Other

Page 700

JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101

Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

SMITH, ORIANNE Spring 2007

Page 701 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

& descrimation 12	Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect														
				Fr	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														
	ights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6		4.37	779/1522		4.17	4.30	4.34	4.37
	ake clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	592/1522	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.47
_	ns reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1		13	4.53	509/1285	4.16	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.53
	s reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8			519/1476		4.37			4.47
	s contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1			4.68			4.13	4.06	4.03	4.68
_	nts contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	594/1381	4.13	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.26
Was the grading syst	em clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	527/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.47
8. How many times was c	lass cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	911/1517	4.77	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.68
9. How would you grade	the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	554/1497	3.95	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.35
	Lecture														
1. Were the instructor'	s lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	492/1440	4.55	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.74
	eem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1			802/1448		4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79
	presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	436/1436	4.50	4.31	4.29		4.65
	tribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	514/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.61
	niques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1221				3.94	****
	Discussion														
1 Did alass disquesion	s contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4 64	298/1280	4 62	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.64
	tively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3			340/1277		4.52			
	ncourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2			277/1269		4.54		4.39	
4. Were special techniq	-	5	2	2	0	2	4			625/ 854					
i. Were Special eccining	deb baccebbrar	3	-	-	J	2	-	-	3.07	0237 031	3.03	1.05	1.02	1.00	3.07
	Laboratory						_	_							
2. Were you provided wi	th adequate background information	1.7	0	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	4.50	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
	Seminar														
5. Were criteria for gr	ading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****
	Field Work														
	contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly unde	rstand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****
	vailable for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could	you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help	you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****
	Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced syste	m contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	***	****	4.63	5.00	***
	make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 23		****	4.41	****	***
	ith the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****
-	oring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	***	****
	Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	_	-								m				Madaza	
crears rarmed	Cum. GPA Expected Grades					asons	, - – – –			Ту 	 ħe			Majors 	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	 7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			

? 1

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

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2007

Page 702

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI Spring 2007
Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	Ο	0	2	1	5	7	4 13	1022/1522	4.25	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	7		1080/1522	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	5	5		1065/1285	4.16	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	971/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	538/1412	4.48	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	806/1381	4.13	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	2	0	7	3.77	,	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	600/1517	4.77	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1261/1497	3.95	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	969/1440	4.55	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	629/1448	4.82	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	772/1436	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1108/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	324/1280	4.62	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	903/1277	4.44	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	586/1269	4.68	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	643/ 854	3.65	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.63
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101 Title ART OF THE ESSAY Instructor:

FARABAUGH, ROBI

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 24 Baltimore County Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Page 703 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	669/1522	4.46	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	738/1522	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	660/1476	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	709/1412	4.09	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	263/1381	4.58	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	11	4.04	966/1500	4.04	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	438/1517	4.92	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	602/1497	4.30	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	904/1440	4.42	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	865/1436	4.26	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	877/1432	4.26	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	376/1280	4.52	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	363/1277	4.76	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	501/1269	4.62	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	625/ 854	3.67	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.67
	_	_	_	-	_	_	_		,					

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	9
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101 University of Maryland Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 704

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

FALCO, RAPHAEL

Instructor:

							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 vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	305/1522	4.76	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.76
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	686/1522		4.25	4.26	4.25	4.41
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	446/1285		4.32	4.30	4.30	4.59
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	444/1476		4.37	4.22	4.26	4.53
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	71/1412		4.13	4.06	4.03	4.94
				o what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	,		4.36	4.08	4.13	4.31
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.63
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1301/1517	4.20	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.20
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.67
		Lecture																
		actor's lecture			1	-	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	578/1440		4.32		4.46	4.69
		ctor seem inter		-	1	-	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1448		4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	1		0	0	3	3	10	4.44			4.31	4.29	4.30	4.44
		es contribute to		-	1	-	0	0	0	2		4.88	200/1432		4.27	4.29	4.29	4.88
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	13	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	***
		Discus	gion															
1 Did di	lace diec			what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	814/1280	3.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.92
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	908/1277	4.08	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.08
				d open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	828/1269		4.54	4.31	4.39	4.17
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	5	11	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 854		4.05	4.02	4.00	****
T. WEIE	special ce	ecinitques succe	ssiui		J	11	U	U	Τ.	U	U	3.00	/ 054		1.05	1.02	1.00	
				Frequ	ency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits H	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	8
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	guir	ed f	or M	 ajor		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 7								-		-	-) ~		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ge:	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L7	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ah
	-			P 0		_							respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.	her				1	.4					-	
				? 1		00.					_	-						

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

Spring 200

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 31

Maryland	Page 705	
ounty	JUN 26, 2007	
007	Job IRBR3029	

Questions	NR	NA		-	cies 3		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	2	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	681/1522	4.45	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	639/1522	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	446/1285	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.59

٥.	Did the exam questions refrect the expected goars	2	U	U			5	21	4.33	440/1203	4.33	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.33
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.33
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	248/1412	4.64	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.64
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	575/1381	4.29	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.29
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.57
8.	How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.75
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	12	14	4.44	457/1497	4.44	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.44

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	1	25	4.79	392/1440	4.79	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	27	4.89	521/1448	4.89	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	25	4.82	198/1436	4.82	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.82

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	U	1	U	U	3	24	4.75 350/1432	4./5	4.2/	4.29	4.29	4./5
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	23	1	0	0	0	3	4.00 ****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	324/1280	4.61	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	299/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	310/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	341/ 854	4.24	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.24

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	31	Non-major	13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101 Title

BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO

Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 706 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	1027/1522	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	519/1476	4.47	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	167/1412	4.75	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	556/1381	4.30	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	882/1500	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	1128/1517	4.45	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	820/1497	4.11	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	578/1440	4.68	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	576/1436	4.53	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	490/1432	4.63	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	311/1280	4.63	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	308/1277	4.81	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	493/1269	4.63	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	705/ 854	3.40	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.40

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 707 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	28	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101

38

AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR

HOLTON, ADALAIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

	<u>.</u>						Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	492/1522	4.61	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.61
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.78
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.75
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	236/1476	4.74	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.74
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	22	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.67
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	255/1381	4.59	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.59
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	374/1500	4.62	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.62
8. How m	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	1	20	6	4.19	1307/1517	4.19	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.19
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	288/1440	4.85	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.85
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.92
3. Was 1	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.80
4. Did t	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	6	19	4.76	338/1432	4.76	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.76
5. Did a	 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi 							2	7	8	5	3.61	860/1221	3.61	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.61
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc			what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.67
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	2	7		4.50	594/1277		4.52	4.34	4.38	4.50
				d open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	516/1269	4.59	4.54	4.31		4.59
		echniques succe			7	9	1	0	7	2	2	3.33	726/ 854		4.05			3.33
				Frequ	enas	. Diet	-ri b	ıtior	2									
				riequ	iency	ומבע	LIID	10101	.1									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12						 guire	ed fo	or Ma	aior	 s	2	Graduat	 e	1	 Majo	 or	24
28-55														-				
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 5 C 5					Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	major	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 8 F 0						ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ιh
P 0													respons				_	
	I O		Otl	ner				2	12	-								
		? 1																

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

Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 33

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 708 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	8	21	4.42	707/1522	4.42	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	25	4.55	499/1522	4.55	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	27	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	406/1476	4.58	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	5	25	4.63	265/1412	4.63	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	214/1381	4.66	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	6	21	4.55	444/1500	4.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	341/1517	4.94	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	31	4.94	346/1448	4.94	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	24	4.69	394/1436	4.69	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	26	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	3	4	4	13	3.88	707/1221	3.88	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	6	18	4.52	383/1280		4.32	4.10	4.14	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	433/1277	4.70	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	1	0	8	7	4	3.65	630/ 854	3.65	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.65

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 320 0101 University of Maryland Page 709
Title TOPICS IN CT Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: WEXLER, LAURA Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 16

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

Questionnaires: 11

					Frequencies					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 n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1522	4.90	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.90
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1285	4.86	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.86
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.50
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	92/1381	4.89	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.89
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	109/1500	4.90	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.90
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.75
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00		
4. Did th	e lectur	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00		
				our understanding	4	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were a	11 stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	=			Ту	ne			Majors	:
00-27								ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3				_				_	_	_	_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2							2	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	=1							_		. =				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives							1	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0							respons	es to k	e sign	ıiıcan	ıt			
				I 0		Other						4						

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101 University of Maryla
Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH Baltimore County
Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER Spring 2007

University of Maryland Page 710
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	25					
Ouestionnaires:	16		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

								equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 l															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1190/1522	3.94	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.94
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1276/1522	3.73	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.73
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	7	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	1141/1476	3.88	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.88
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	680/1412	4.13	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.13
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	774/1381	4.07	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.07
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	2	3	1	4	6	3.56	1276/1500	3.56	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.56
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1185/1517	4.38	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.38
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1034/1497	3.91	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.91
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instr	ctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	2	3	2	1	5	3.31	1390/1440	3.31	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.31
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	2	2	9		1131/1448		4.71		4.71	4.54
				xplained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	2	5		1231/1436		4.31	4.29	4.30	3.69
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	2	2	2	5		1224/1432		4.27	4.29	4.29	3.67
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi							2	2	2	5	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.67
		P																
1 544		Discus		1 t 1 1	_	0	1	^	1	2	_	4 10	621/1000	4 10	4 20	4 10	4 1 4	4 10
				what you learned	5	0	1	0 1	1	3 1	6 8	4.18	631/1280 643/1277		4.52		4.14	4.18
				d to participate d open discussion	5 5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.45	485/1269		4.54			4.45
		ctor encourage . echniques succes		a open discussion	5	2	2	0	1	0	8 6	3.89	533/ 854			4.31	4.39	3.89
4. Were S	врестат се	eciniiques succes	SSIUI		5	۷	۷	U	1	U	0	3.09	555/ 654	3.09	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.09
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8						guir	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	12
28-55							-10-1		10	- ,	-	-	or adda c	-	-		-	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
I 0						Ot1	her				1	.3	_		_			
		? 0																

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101 University of Maryland STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH FITZPATRICK, CA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

32

Page 711 Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

					Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	965/1522		4.25	4.26	4.25	4.17
		uestions reflect		-	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	456/1285		4.32	4.30	4.30	4.58
	_	uations reflect		_	0	5	0	3	3	4	4		1257/1476		4.37	4.22	4.26	3.64
				what you learned	1	1	5	2	1	4	5		1317/1412		4.13	4.06	4.03	3.12
				o what you learned	1	0	9	2	1	3	3		1363/1381		4.36	4.08	4.13	2.39
		g system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	0	5	13				4.10	4.18	4.13	4.72
	_	was class cance	_		1	1	0	0	0	2		4.88	,		4.47	4.65		4.88
	-			hing effectiveness	3	1	1	1	5	5	3		1265/1497		4.22			3.53
	-	3		3														
		Lecture																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.25	
2. Did	the instru	n the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	859/1448	4.75	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.75		
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1169/1436	3.88	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.88
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	3	1	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	970/1432	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	3	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****
		Discuss	ni on															
1 Did	clace diec			what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.29
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	421/1277		4.52	4.34	4.38	4.71
				d open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.57
		echniques succes		a open albeabbion	5	11	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 854		4.05	4.02	4.00	****
		1											,					
		Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n											
Credits	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3			
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9								ed f	or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000	1411	ca I	JI 140	٠٠٠	5	0	Graduat	_	0	11000	-	13
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ger	nera	1				4	Under-q	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	4
84-150	_	3.00-3.49	2	D 1			a	_				-	011001 9	1	-	2.021		-

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101

CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT

Title Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 712 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	7	12	4.27	879/1522	4.27	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	13	4.23	904/1522	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	15	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	288/1412	4.59	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	361/1381	4.48	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	13	4.32	720/1500	4.32	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	487/1517	4.90	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	765/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	696/1436	4.43	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	611/1432	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	387/1221	4.37	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	207/1280	4.78	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	277/ 854	4.35	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.35
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****
Self Paced					_									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	***

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101

Title CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT

Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 712 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 713 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	9	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------------	--------------	---------------

Course-Section: ENGL 346 0101

18

LITERARY THEMES

FALCO, RAPHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.89	190/1522	4.89	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	٥	8	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.22	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.03	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0		1389/1517	4.00	4.10	4.16	4.13	4.00
-	1	0	0	0	0	9	8	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.47	4.05	4.02	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Т	U	U	U	U	U	8	5.00	1/149/	5.00	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	904/1440	4.43	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****
Discussion					_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	***	4.05	4.02	4.00	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101 University of Maryland Page 714 Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

Instructor: ORLIN, LENA Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 24
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	14	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			1	0	3	6	14	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	7	10	4.14	857/1285	4.14	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	12	6	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	265/1412	4.63	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	11	6	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	4.36	4.08	4.13	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	556/1500	4.46	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1246/1517	4.29	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	421/1497	4.47	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	774/1440	4.52	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	1	17		1060/1448		4.71	4.71	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	2	14	4.43	696/1436		4.31	4.29	4.30	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	732/1432	4.43	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	232/1221	4.57	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.57
Discussion	_	0	-	•	_	_	1.0	4 20	400/1000	4 20	4 20	4 10	4 1 4	4 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	Ţ	0	2	3	12	4.39	492/1280		4.32	4.10	4.14	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	409/1277	4.72	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	361/1269		4.54	4.31	4.39	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	Τ	3	Τ	4	3	3.42	701/ 854	3.42	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.42

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-	-	_	
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 369 0101 University of Maryl Title RACE ETHNICITY US LIT Baltimore County Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

25

University of Maryland Page 715
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

C+11don+	Comman	Errolmotion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	414/1522	4.69	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1476	4.79	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	111/1412	4.88	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.88
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	ed 0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	114/1381	4.81	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.81
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	425/1500	4.56	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.56
3. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	12	1	3.93	1431/1517	3.93	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.93
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	ss 2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	280/1497	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.64
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	763/1440	4.53	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	346/1448	4.93	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.67
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	372/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.73
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	g 1	2	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	474/1221	4.23	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.23
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	370/1280	4.53	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	398/1277	4.73	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	156/1269	4.93	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.93
. Were special techniques successful	1	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.00	****
Fre	equency	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	es			Re	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	5	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101 University of Maryland Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI Baltimore County SHIVNAN, SALLY

> ? 0

Page 716 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

I	nstructor:	SHIVNAN,	SALLY			Sp
E	nrollment:	17				
_		1 2		0	~	177

Furoriment.	Ι/
Questionnaires:	13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque:	ncies	5		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	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	305/1522	4.77	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.77
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	322/1522	4.69	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.69
		uestions reflec			0	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	216/1476	4.77	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.77
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	655/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.15
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1381	4.92	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.92
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	454/1500	4.54	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.54
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.85	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.85
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	304/1497	4.62	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.62
		Lectur																
1 Were +1	he instr	ictor's lecture		nrenared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.75
					1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.73	444/1448	4.73	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.73
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.33
				our understanding	2	4	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	343/1221	4.43	3.73	3.93	3.94	
5. Did au	ulovisual	r teciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	۷	4	U	U	Τ.	۷	4	4.43	343/1221	4.43	3./3	3.93	3.94	4.43
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1280	4.90	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.90
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/1277	4.90	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.90
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.90
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	4	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.50
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	l
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4								_	_	_	_			_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					8						

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101 University of Marylar Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING Baltimore County Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

5

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Questionnaires: 17

21

University of Maryland Page 717
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

1

11

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	n Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

							Frequencies			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	u gain na	ew insights,ski		om this source	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.38
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.63
		estions reflec			1	5	1	1	2	1	6		1027/1285	3.91	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.91
	_	ations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	416/1476	4.56	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.56
				what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	964/1412	3.81	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.81
	-	-		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	233/1381		4.36	4.08	4.13	4.63
		g system clearly		-	1	0	1	2	1	7	5		1141/1500	3.81	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.81
		was class cance	-	ainea	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81		4.81	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.81
	ow would you grade the overall teaching effective		ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	4		718/1497		4.22	4.11	4.13		
	2	,		. .														
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			prepared	3	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	1023/1440	4.29	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.29
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	935/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	772/1436	4.36	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.36
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	963/1432	4.14	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.14
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	your understanding	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	950/1221	3.42	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.42
1 5 1		Discus			0	0	-	•	-	-	_	4 00	605/1000	4 00	4 20	4 10	4 1 4	4 00
				what you learned	8	0	1	0	Τ	Τ	6	4.22	605/1280		4.32	4.10	4.14	4.22
		_	_	ed to participate	8	0	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	827/1277	4.22	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.22
		ctor encourage : echniques succe		nd open discussion	8 8	0 4	1	0	1	0	3	4.33	721/1269 426/ 854	4.33	4.54 4.05	4.31	4.39	4.33
4. Were s	peciai te	eciniques succes	SSLUI		0	4	U	Т	1	U	3	4.00	420/ 054	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6				Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	11	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														

Electives

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 386 0101

Title ADULT LITERACY TUTORIN

Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

ARTHY, LUCIL

I

?

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 718 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies			;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.44
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	639/1522	4.44	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	827/1476	4.22	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.22
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.78
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.78	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.78
9. How wo	How would you grade the overall teaching effective Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.71	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.71	
			-															
					1 1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	953/1440		4.32	4.45	4.46	4.38
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448		4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
							0	0	0	4	4	4.50			4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	0	1	2	4		1036/1432		4.27	4.29	4.29	4.00
5. Did au	 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 				2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****
	Discussion																	
				what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	585/1280		4.32	4.10	4.14	4.25
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277		4.52	4.34	4.38	4.63
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	381/1269		4.54	4.31	4.39	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sstul		1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	174/ 854	4.57	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.57
		Semina			_						_							
	_	-		announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****
				ividual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****
	_	-		what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65		4.75	4.49	4.33	****
		ons contribute t for grading made		you learned	8 8	0	0	0	0 1	1 0	0	4.00	****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	4.38	4.45 4.11	4.34	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
	_			_	.01107	210												
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Major					S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4								_						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	Τ				6	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ſħ
				P 0		0.1	2 0 30					2	respons	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	

Other

2

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 13

E	age	/19	
JUN	26,	2007	
Job	IRB	R3029	

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Quest:	lonnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	----------

	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1074/1522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1080/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1114/1285	3.69	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	435/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	5	1	3	3.23	1293/1412	3.49	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	458/1381	4.53	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	5	3.85	1123/1500	3.79	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1054/1517	4.05	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1089/1497	4.05	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	751/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.76	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	551/1436	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	935/1432	4.20	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	359/1221	4.30	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	Ο	2	1	2	4.00	718/1280	4.31	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.65	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	816/1269	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	4.11	4.05	4.02	4.00	****
	-			-	=	-	_		,					

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201

Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 720 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fre	eque	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	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	869/1522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.29
		tor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	3	13	4.29	844/1522		4.25	4.26	4.25	4.29
		estions reflect			1	17	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1285	3.69	4.32	4.30	4.30	***
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	519/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.48
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	5	9	3.86	932/1412	3.49	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.86
6. Did wr:	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	314/1381	4.53	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.52
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	1	1	4	3	4	8	3.70	1219/1500	3.79	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.70
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	623/1517	4.05	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.84
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	731/1497	4.05	4.22	4.11	22 4.26 66 4.03 08 4.13 18 4.13 55 4.62 11 4.13 45 4.46 71 4.71 4.30 4.29 4.29 3.94 4.30 4.30 4.29 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30	4.19
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture		orepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.76
					ject 0 0 0 0 0 5 16 4.76 840/1448 4.76 4.71 4.71		4.71	4.71	4.76									
			esented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1		1	5	15	4.67	415/1436	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.67				
		s contribute to		you learned 0 0 0 2 1 7 11 4.29 862/1432 4.20 4.27 4.29		4.29	4.29	4.29										
				our understanding	0	17	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1221	4.30	3.73	3.93	3.94	****
	Discussion																	
1 Did ala	acc diccu			what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	553/1280	4.31	4.32	4.10	4 14	4.30
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	317/1277	4.65	4.52	4.34		4.80
				d open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	547/1269	4.52	4.54	4.31		4.55
		chniques succes		a open arboabbion	1	6	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	505/ 854		4.05	4.02		3.93
		- 1																
1 54 - 5	.]	Laborat rease understa	-	E + h = + 1	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	++++	++++	4.36	4 01	****
				ground information	20 20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
1																		
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 aior		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majc	 or	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 10			-1 ~ -1 ,)	-	_	or adda c	-	-		_	-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 4		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	4.25 4.30 4.26 4.03 4.13 4.13 4.62 4.13 4.46 4.71 4.30 4.29 3.94 4.14 4.38 4.39 4.00 4.29 Majors or	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.7						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNA Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 18

Page 721 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	('Ollrse	Evaluation	()llestion	naire

			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	1	7	1	6	2 02	1254/1522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	10	4.17	965/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	1		****/1285	3.69	4.32	4.30	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	11	4.41	613/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	2	2	7.1		1239/1412	3.49	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	207/1381	4.53	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	4	1	T. 4		1129/1500	3.79	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	5	8	3	0		1511/1517	4.05	4.10	4.10	4.13	2.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	٥	5	4.13	807/1497		4.47	4.11		4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	U	3	8	5	4.13	807/1497	4.05	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	7	7	4.19	1100/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	977/1448	4.76	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	987/1436	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	977/1432	4.20	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	500/1221	4.30	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.20
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding		O	U	U	5		,	1.20	300/1221	1.50	3.73	3.93	3.91	1.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	305/1280	4.31	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	567/1277	4.65	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1269	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	314/ 854	4.11	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.29
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			
				2	1						

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 722

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101 University of Maryland Title JUN 26, 2007 TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 ı															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	605/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.50
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
		estions reflect	_	_	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.30	5.00
	_	ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
			_	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
		system clearly		-	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		483/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.50
		was class cance	-		1	0	0	0	0	1	1		1080/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.50
	-			ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.00
		,		J									,					
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00		
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.73	3.93	3.94	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
				open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssful		0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	auire		or Ma	iors		0	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1		110	1011	-	01 110	. ,		•	OI adda o	_	Ü	1100) 0	-	_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-			-		5	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Otl	her					2	-		3			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 723 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0201

4

TUTORIAL IN WRITING

BENSON, LINDA K

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	932/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301 University of Maryland Page 724
Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 2

4. Were special techniques successful

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	605/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	988/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_		
				2	Λ						

0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/854 5.00 4.05 4.02 4.00 5.00

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 0401	University of Maryland	Page 725
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	FALLON, MICHAEL	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	793/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	820/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 726 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

(uestionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
`	acocidinatics.	5	Deddelle	COULDC	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501

3

TUTORIAL IN WRITING

FALLON, MICHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	Λ	Λ	0	Λ	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/12/7	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00
i. Here apectar decimitques successivi	_	_	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	1/ 034	3.00	1.05	1.02	1.00	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ation	n									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 727 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0601

3

TUTORIAL IN WRITING

FALLON, MICHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

		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	2	1		814/1522			4.30	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		1080/1522		4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	703/1476		4.37	4.22	4.26	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1353/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1036/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	530/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701 University of Maryland Page 728
Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 3

Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Instru	actor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
	0	0	0	^	0	0	-	F 00	1 /1 4 4 0	4 01	4 20	4 4 5	1 10	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432		4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.73	3.93	3.94	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i o	า									
11040					-									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 0801	University of Maryland	Page 729
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITIN	G Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Tratameter:	CIITIMIANI CATTV	Coming 2007	Tob TDDD2020

Job IRBR3029 SHIVNAN, SALLY Spring 2007 Instructor: Enrollment:

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

Questionnaires: 1

			Fre	equei	ncies	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	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1327/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 730

1/1269 5.00 4.54 4.31 4.39 5.00

1/854 5.00 4.05 4.02 4.00 5.00

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 2

5

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

4. Were special techniques successful

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1001 University of Maryland JUN 26, 2007 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA Job IRBR3029

													_	
			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
1														

0 1 Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00

0

0 0 1 5.00

0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1	
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	nificant		
				I	0	Other	2	_				
				2	0							

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101 University of Maryland Page 731
Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	25	
Questionnaires:	20	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies	3	_		tructor	Course	_			
		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	2	8	7	3	3.55	1383/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.55
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	6	8	4	3.70	1290/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.70
		uestions reflec			0	15	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	938/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	682/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.35
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	8	3	3.50	1165/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.50
				o what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	3	3	6	4	4	3.15	1413/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.15
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	802/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.75
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	2	5	6	0	3.31	1355/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.31
		Lectur	•															
1 Were t	he instri	actor's lecture	_	prepared	Λ	0	0	2	6	7	5	3 75	1304/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.75
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	3	7	10		1262/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71		4.35
				explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	8	5		1197/1436		4.31	4.29	4.30	3.80
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	9	4	-		1191/1432		4.27	4.29	4.29	3.75
				our understanding	0	4	3	2	7	2	2		1111/1221			3.93		2.88
1 - 1		Discus			1.0	0	0	-	-	0	_	4 00	E10/1000	2 55	4 20	4 10	4 1 4	4 00
				what you learned	13	0	0	Ţ	Ţ	2	3	4.00	718/1280			4.10	4.14	4.00
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	3		,	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.14
		_		d open discussion	13	0 1	0	1	0	2	4		756/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.29
4. were s	pecial te	echniques succe	SSIUI		13	Τ	U	1	1	4	0	3.50	673/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.50
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12		~		,				0	1	, ,				1.0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								1			1			1.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - :				_	ın
						0-1					1	_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	16	
				I 0		Oti	her				1	.6						
				: 1														

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

University of Maryland JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 732

24 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Questions		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4						5	Inst Mean	tructo: Rai			e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General																
1. Di	d yo	u gain	new insights, skills fr	rom this course	0	0	4	2	4	3	4	3.06	1485/	1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.06
2. Di	d th	e instr	ructor make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	8	3.76	1262/	1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.76
			questions reflect the	_	1	13	0	0	0	2	1		****/		3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	****
			aluations reflect the e		0	0	1	3	5	4	4		1346/			4.37	4.22		3.41
		_	readings contribute to	_	0	9	1	0	5	2	0		1327/		3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.00
			assignments contribute ing system clearly expl	-	0	0	3	1 2	1 3	6 6	6 3		1108/		4.00 3.55	4.36	4.08 4.18	4.13 4.13	3.65 3.24
		_	es was class cancelled	tained	0	0	0	0	2	12			1372/			4.10			4.06
		_	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	6	3					3.64				3.00
			Lecture																
			tructor's lectures well		0	0	2	0	6	4	5		1347/		3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.59
			ructor seem interested		0	0	2	2	1	8	4		1417/		4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	3.59
			material presented and	=	1	0	2	0	5	4	5		1254/		3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.63
			res contribute to what	_	0	0	5	0	4 5	5			1359/		3.57			4.29	3.06
5. D1	.a au	alovisu	ual techniques enhance	your understanding	1	1	3	U	5	3	4	3.33	983/.	1221	3.11	3./3	3.93	3.94	3.33
			Discussion																
			scussions contribute to	-	9	0	0	1	3	2	2		978/			4.32		4.14	3.63
			dents actively encourag		9	0	1	0	1	3	3		1024/		4.01			4.38	3.88
			ructor encourage fair a	and open discussion	9 9	0	1 1	0	1 1	3 2		3.88			4.03				3.88 ****
4. we	ere s	pecial	techniques successful		9	4	T	U	Ι	2	0	3.00	***/	854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	^ ^ ^ ^
			Laboratory										****/ 215 **** ****						
			increase understanding		15	0	0	0	1	1	0		, , 213			****			
	_	_	vided with adequate bac		15	0	0	0	1	0	1) ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.29 ***						
			ry materials available		15 15	1 0	0	0	0	1 2	0		****/		****	****		4.45	****
			instructor provide assi ments for lab reports o		15	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/		****	****	4.42	4.35	****
3. WC	.10 1	cquirc	_	sicarry specifica	13	_	_	O	Ü	Ü	O	1.00	,	203			1.25	1.20	
4 5'	,		Seminar		1.0	0	0	•	-	0	0	2 00	ate ate ate ate of	п.	ale ale ale ale	4 20	4 45	4 24	****
	_		tions contribute to what	-	16 16	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/	78 80	****	4.38	4.45	4.34 3.33	****
o. we	ire c	riceria	a for grading made clea	11	10	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	,	80		4.33	4.11	3.33	
			Field Work																
		_	perience contribute to	_	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	****	4.41		****
	_		rly understand your eva		16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	****	4.30	4.39	****
4. 10) WIIA	t degre	ee could you discuss yo	our evaluations	16	U	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/	35			4.31	4.26	
1 Di	d ao	1f_nage	Self Paced ed system contribute to	what wou learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/	37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****
1. DI	u se	II-pace	ed system contribute to	o what you rearned	10	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	,	3 /			4.03	5.00	
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credi	ts E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5				Тур	ре 			Majors	5
00-2		0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Gra	duate	e	0	Maj	or	0
28-5		0	1.00-1.99 1	B 3		_		,				0			, .				
56-8		0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Und	er-gi	rad 1	L 1/	Non	-major	17
84-1 Grad		11 0	3.00-3.49 2 3.50-4.00 9	D 0 F 0		. רק	ecti	770C		0 #### - Means there are not eno		t enous	rh						
GLau		U	3.30-4.00	P 0		E1.	LULI	v C 5		0 #### - Means there are not enounce responses to be significant		_	1+1						
				I O		Ot]	her				1	.5	100	-0110	-2 CO 1	o sigi	ca		
				*			-			15									

? 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 733

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401

21

TECHNICAL WRITING

ROCKETT, DANIKA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

					1						ructor		Dept					
		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	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	767/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.38
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	334/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.69
		estions reflec			0	2	1	0	2	5		4.07	898/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.07
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	316/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	629/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.19
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10		331/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.50
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	720/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.31
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1268/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.25
	-			ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	525/1497	3.64		4.11	4.13	4.38
		•		3														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	orepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	891/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.44
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	737/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.81
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	478/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.60
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0					784/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.38		
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	9	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	956/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.40
		_																
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	3	1	0	6	3.90	825/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.90
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	903/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.10
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	743/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.30
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	2	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	426/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 9	Required for Majors 0				0	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	r r	0			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2	Required for Majors 0								3					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				Р 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	0	_					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: HESS, LAURIE

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 9

Page 734 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1043/1522 3.64 4.17 4.30 4.34 4.12 1. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 639/1522 3.69 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 316/1476 4.15 4.37 4.22 4.26 4.65 1. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 7 4.67 316/1476 4.15 4.37 4.22 4.26 4.65 1. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 207/1381 4.00 4.36 4.08 4.13 4.66 1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 207/1381 4.00 4.36 4.08 4.13 4.67 1. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 207/1381 4.00 4.36 4.08 4.13 4.67 1. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 1. Was the grading system clearly explained 1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1. We would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 782/1497 3.64 4.22 4.11 4.13 4.16 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. We would you learned and explained clearly 1. We would you do not be a subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 1. Did cleas discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did cleas discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.40 477/1280 3.57 4.23 4.10 4.14 4.46 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.66 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00/47/47/47/47 4.30 4.14 2. Were all students actively encouraged to pa									Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1043/1522 3.84 4.17 4.30 4.34 4.12 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 5 4.44 639/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.10 4.12 4.25 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.10 4.12 4.25 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.45 4.26 4.25 4.45 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26			Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 1043/1522 3.84 4.17 4.30 4.34 4.12 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 5 4.44 639/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.89 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.10 4.12 4.25 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.44 4.11 1043/1522 3.10 4.12 4.25 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.45 4.26 4.25 4.45 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26			Genera	 1																	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 316/1476 4.15 4.7 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 316/1476 4.15 4.37 4.22 4.26 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 1 2 3 3 3.63 1100/1412 3.40 4.13 4.06 4.03 3.63 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 207/1381 4.00 4.36 4.03 4.13 4.66 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 207/1381 4.00 4.36 4.03 4.13 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 4 3.89 1099/1500 3.55 4.04 4.03 4.03 4.05 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.46 7 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.71 4.22 4.21 932/1448 4.18 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.22 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 4.00 1186/1440 3.86 4.32 4.45 4.46 4.07 933 933 934 3.89 933 934 938 933 934 938 933 934 938 933 934 938 934 938 934 938 938 938 938 938 938 938 938 938 938	1. Did vo	ou gain ne			om this cour	rse	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1043/1	522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	_	_							-	0	-										4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 2 2 3 3.63 1100/1412 3.40 4.13 4.06 4.03 3.66 . Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 207/1381 4.00 4.36 4.08 4.13 4.66 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 1099/1500 3.55 4.10 4.18 4.13 3.86 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 2 3 4 4.00 1186/1440 3.86 4.22 4.11 4.13 4.17 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71					_		0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67							4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 7 7 4.67 207/1381 4.00 4.36 4.08 4.13 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 1099/1500 3.55 4.10 4.18 4.13 3.83 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 2 4 3.89 1099/1500 3.55 4.10 4.18 4.13 3.83 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 782/1497 3.64 4.22 4.11 4.13 4.14 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 782/1497 3.64 4.22 4.11 4.13 4.14 1. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 2 4 4.00 1186/1440 3.86 4.32 4.45 4.46 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1310/1448 4.18 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 3 3.89 1134/1432 3.57 4.27 4.29 4.30 4.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 3 3.89 1134/1432 3.57 4.27 4.29 4.30 4.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 2 4 1 3.86 727/1221 3.11 3.73 3.93 3.94 3.86 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.00 477/1280 3.57 4.22 4.30 4.14 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.60 3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 47 *** *** 4.41 4.56 *** 4. Were special techniques successful *** 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					_		0	1	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1100/1	412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 932/1517 4.31 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 782/1497 3.64 4.22 4.11 4.13 4.14 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 4.00 1186/1440 3.86 4.32 4.45 4.46 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1310/1448 4.18 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.23 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 672/1436 3.90 4.31 4.29 4.30 4.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 3 3.89 1134/1432 3.57 4.27 4.29 4.29 3.85 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 2 4 1 3.86 727/1221 3.11 3.73 3.93 3.94 3.84 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 477/1280 3.57 4.32 4.10 4.14 4.44 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.66 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 ***** **** 4.30 4.12 ***** ******** **** 4.30 4.12 ************************************							0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	207/1	381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.67
Lecture Lect	7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained		0	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1099/1	500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.89
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture metrial presented and explained clearly 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 1. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 8. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 9. Did you	8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	932/1	517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.67
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 4.00 1186/1440 3.86 4.32 4.45 4.46 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1310/1448 4.18 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.21 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 672/1436 3.90 4.31 4.29 4.30 4.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 3 3.89 1134/1432 3.57 4.27 4.29 4.29 3.85 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 2 4 1 3.86 727/1221 3.11 3.73 3.93 3.94 3.86 727/1221	9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effect	iveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	782/1	497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 1310/1448 4.18 4.71 4.71 4.22 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 672/1436 3.90 4.31 4.29 4.30 4.44 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.5			Lectur	e																	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 672/1436 3.90 4.31 4.29 4.30 4.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 2 3 3.89 1134/1432 3.57 4.27 4.29 4.29 3.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 0 2 4 1 3.86 727/1221 3.11 3.73 3.93 3.94 3.86 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 477/1280 3.57 4.32 4.10 4.14 4.46 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.66 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.66 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.66 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 166/854 3.95 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.66 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4.70 What degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4.70 What degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared		0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1186/1	440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 2 3 3.89 1134/1432 3.57 4.27 4.29 4.29 3.89 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 2 4 1 3.86 727/1221 3.11 3.73 3.93 3.94 3.86 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 477/1280 3.57 4.32 4.10 4.14 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.60 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 166/854 3.95 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.60 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subje	ect	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1310/1	448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.22
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 477/1280 3.57 4.32 4.10 4.14 4.40 4.60 4.30 4.31 4.34 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.60 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained cl	learly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	672/1	436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.44
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 477/1280 3.57 4.32 4.10 4.14 4.44 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.64 4.00 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.64 4.00 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.64 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.60 4.00 4.60 4.00 4.60 4.00 4.60 4.00 4.0	4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	i .	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1134/1	432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.89
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 477/1280 3.57 4.32 4.10 4.14 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.66 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.66 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 166/854 3.95 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.66 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 3.95 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.60 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your underst	anding	1	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	727/1	221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 527/1277 4.01 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.60 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			Discus	sion																	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 509/1269 4.03 4.54 4.31 4.39 4.60 4.00 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 166/854 3.95 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.60 Eield Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	1. Did cl	lass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you le	earned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	477/1	280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.40
## A. Were special techniques successful ## A. O. O. O. O. D. 2. 3. 4.60 166/ 854 3.95 4.05 4.02 4.00 4.60 Field Work The properties of the structure of	2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to partic	cipate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1	.277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.60
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** *** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open disc	cussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1	269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.60
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful			4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	166/	854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.60
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1			Field	Work																	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	1. Did fi	ield exper	rience contribu	te to v	what you lea	arned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2. Did yo	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	luation crit	eria	8	0				0	1	5.00	****/	45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors							8	0					1	5.00	****/	39	****	****		4.68	****
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		_	_	_			8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35		****	4.31	4.26	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	5. Did co	onferences	s help you carr	y out f	field activi	ities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1						Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n										
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades				Re	asons	5				Туј	pe			Majors	;
	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 s	0	 Grad	 luat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
56-83	28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1				_				_	_		_	q			

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	7				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601 University of Maryland Page 735
Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: HESS, LAURIE Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

22

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	2	2	2	2.67	1505/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	1	2	0	4		1494/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1394/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	0	5	1	0	2.18	1398/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	2.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1338/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1388/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1355/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	0	3	3	0	2.50	1476/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	2	1	3		1404/1440		4.32	4.45	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1441/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	3	1	3		1378/1436		4.31	4.29	4.30	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	0	2	1	2	2.36	1409/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	2.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	1188/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	1	0		1273/1280		4.32	4.10	4.14	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	0	0	1		1272/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1258/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701

17

TECHNICAL WRITING

HESS, LAURIE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Page 736 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		0	_		MD	NA		_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S 		NR	NA			3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1122/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.00
_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	0	1	1	3	9		670/1522		4.25	4.26	4.25	4.43
		estions reflec			2	11	0	0	0	1	2		****/1285	3.92		4.30	4.30	****
	_	uations reflect		_	2	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	473/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.50
				what you learned	3	1	3	0	2	2	5	3.50	1165/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	272/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.57
		g system clearl			2	1	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	882/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.15
		was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	983/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.62
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	769/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.15
		Lectur	<u>e</u>															
1. Were ti	he instru	actor's lecture	_	prepared	3	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1186/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.00
		ctor seem inter			2		0	0	1				1024/1448			4.71		
				xplained clearly	3		0	1					1018/1436				4.30	4.08
		es contribute t			3	0	3	1	1	3	5	3.46	1284/1432	3.57			4.29	
				our understanding	3		1	2	2	1			983/1221					3.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	718/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.00
				d to participate		0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1277		4.52			
				d open discussion	12	0	0	0			3	4.50		4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.50
		echniques succe			12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854			4.02	4.00	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_														
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors					S	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0				
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 0 #### -							_	h								
	P 0 responses to be signific				ifican	ıt												
			I 0 Other 11															

?

0

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Field Work

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 15

Page 737 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				~										
			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	1	1	3	1	9	4.07	1081/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	1211/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1111/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33			4.37	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	1029/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	988/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	11	3	4.07	1368/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1167/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	931/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	1241/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	980/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	928/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1111/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	839/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	804/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	692/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	604/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	***	****	4.23	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	***	4.75	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33		3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901 University of Maryland Page 738
Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 18

Student	Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire
Scudenc	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescrommarre

Questionnaires: 14

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Ω	1	4	3	2	4	3 29	1459/1522	3.64	4 17	4.30	4.34	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	3	2		1426/1522		4.25	4.26	4.25	3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	966/1476		4.37	4.22	4.26	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	4	3		1189/1412		4.13	4.06	4.03	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	5	2	1	1		1477/1500		4.10	4.18	4.13	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	5	4		1389/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	3	2		1057/1497		4.22	4.11	4.13	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1324/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1190/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1275/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1284/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	1114/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	0	1		1240/1280		4.32	4.10	4.14	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1		1066/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	875/1269		4.54	4.31	4.39	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ation	n									
	- 2													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 739

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Ouestions				Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did these revaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did other products of the expected goals 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did chain instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did chain instructor's lectures well prepared 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussi	Questions	NR	NA		_			5				_			Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did these revaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did other products of the expected goals 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class is a series of the expected goals 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did chain instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did chain instructor's lectures well prepared 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4. Did class discussi															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 5 2 3 2 3 2.73 1501/1522 2.73 4.25 4.26 4.25 2.73 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 7 1 1 3 0 3 3.8 1205/1252 3.78 4.25 4.26 4.25 2.73 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 1 3 3 3 5 3.47 1334/1476 3.47 4.37 4.22 4.26 3.47 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 1 3 3 3 5 3.47 1334/1476 3.47 4.37 4.22 4.26 3.47 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 1 0 4 1 3 1 6 3.27 1246/1381 3.27 4.36 4.08 4.13 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 5 5 9 4.64 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 3 3 3 3 2.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 3 3 3 3 2 1.31 1495/1397 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1430/1448 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.42 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1430/1448 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.42 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1431/1436 3.42 4.31 4.29 4.30 3.42 4.55 4.66 3.00 930/1277 4.00 4.52 2.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 9. How we special techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 9. How we special techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 9. How we special techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 9. How we special techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 9. How we special techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.93 3.94 1.80 9. How we special techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.93 3.94 1.80 9. How we special t			0	_	0	2	2	0	0 68	1505/1500	0 68	4 15	4 20	4 24	0 68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 7 1 1 3 0 3 3.38 1205/1285 3.38 4.32 4.30 4.30 3.38 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 2 3 3 3.47 1334/1475 3.47 4.37 4.22 4.26 3.47 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 1 3 3 3 2.87 1355/1412 2.87 4.13 4.06 4.03 2.87 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 4 1 3 1 6 3.77 1246/1381 3.27 4.36 4.08 4.13 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 2 4 3 2 4 3.13 1416/1500 3.13 4.10 4.18 4.13 3.13 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 5 5 9 4.48 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.48 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.48 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.49 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.49 952/1517 4.00 4.52 4.11 4.13 3.17 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1			-	-											
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 2 3 3 3 5 3.47 1334/1476 3.47 4.37 4.22 4.26 3.47 5. Did sassigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 1 3 3 3 2.87 1355/1412 2.87 4.13 4.06 4.03 2.87 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 4 3 2 3 1.87 1355/1412 2.87 4.36 4.08 4.13 3.12 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 2 4 3 2 3 1.87 1355/1412 2.87 4.36 4.08 4.13 3.13 8. Now many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 3 3 3 2 3.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 3 2 2 0 4 3.00 1404/1440 3.00 4.32 4.45 4.46 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1311/1436 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.42 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1311/1436 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.42 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 5 1 2 2 3.00 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 Discussion Discussion Discussion 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-			-		-							
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. O 5 1 3 3 3 2 2.87 1355/1412 2.87 4.13 4.06 4.03 2.87 6. Did written assigned graph explained 1 0 2 4 3 2 4 3.13 1416/1500 3.13 4.10 4.18 4.13 3.13 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.55 4.62 4.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 3 3 3 2 3.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 Lecture Lecture 1 2 0 1 3 3 3 3 2 3.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 Lecture 2 1 2 0 1 3 3 3 3 2 3.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 Lecture 2 1 2 1 2 1 3 3 3 3 2 3.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 Lecture 3 2 1 2 2 0 4 3.00 1404/1440 3.00 4.32 4.45 4.46 3.00 2.0 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 131/1436 3.42 4.11 4.71 4.71 3.42 4.10 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 131/1436 3.42 4.11 4.71 4.71 3.42 4.10 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.27 4.29 4.30 3.42 4.10 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 3 1 1 2 3 0.0 1187/1280 3.00 4.32 4.10 4.14 3.00 2.00 Discussion 2 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.27 4.29 4.39 3.59 3.00 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 2 2 1 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.13 4.38 4.00 3.01 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 2 2 1 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.13 4.38 4.00 3.01 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 1 0 2 1 3 3.71 604/854 3.71 4.05 4.02 4.00 3.71 Lecture 3 2 3.00 Did the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															
6. bid written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 4 1 3 1 6 3.27 1246/1381 5.27 4.36 4.08 4.13 3.77 N. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 3 3 3 3 2 3.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 3 2 2 0 0 4 3.00 1404/1440 3.00 4.32 4.45 4.45 3.00 2. Did the instructor geem interested in the subject 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1430/1448 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.42 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 5 1 2 2 4 1 4 3.42 1430/1448 3.42 4.71 4.71 3.74 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.27 4.29 4.29 2.55 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80 1.80			-	_				_							
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 2 4 3 2 4 3.13 1416/1500 3.13 4.10 4.18 4.13 3.13 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 5 9 4.64 92/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.49 4.69 4.69 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 3 3 3 2 3.17 1395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.13 3.17 Lecture 1. Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 3 2 2 0 0 4 3.00 1404/1440 3.00 4.32 4.45 4.46 3.00 2.0 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 131/1446 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.42 4.0 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 131/1446 3.42 4.31 4.29 4.30 3.42 4.0 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.77 4.29 4.39 3.42 4.0 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.77 4.29 4.39 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1187/1280 3.00 4.32 4.10 4.14 3.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00			-					_							
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 9 4.64 952/1517 4.64 4.47 4.65 4.62 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1 3 3 3 2 3.71 395/1497 3.17 4.22 4.11 4.33 3.17 Lecture			•	_											
2. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				_											
Lecture	-		-	-			-	-							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. O 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1330/1448 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.02 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. O 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1311/1436 3.42 4.31 4.29 4.30 3.42 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presented projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced syst	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	Τ	3	3	3	2	3.1/	1395/149/	3.1/	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.1/
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. O 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1330/1448 3.42 4.71 4.71 4.71 3.02 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. O 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1311/1436 3.42 4.31 4.29 4.30 3.42 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presented projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced syst	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1310/1408 3.42 4.31 4.29 4.30 3.42 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.27 4.29 4.29 2.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Did the instructor available for individual attention 8. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Di		5	0	3	2	2	0	4	3.00	1404/1440	3.00	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 2 4 1 4 3.42 1311/1436 3.42 4.31 4.29 4.30 3.42 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.27 4.29 4.29 2.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 187/1280 3.00 4.32 4.10 4.14 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 2 2 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.31 4.39 3.63 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 1 0 2 1 3 3.71 604/854 3.71 4.05 4.02 4.00 3.71 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 ****/228 **** **** 4.35 4.29 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.58 4.53 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		4													
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 5 1 2 2 2 2.58 1397/1432 2.58 4.27 4.29 4.29 2.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 7 4 0 0 0 1 1.80 1207/1221 1.80 3.73 3.93 3.94 1.80 Discussion Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1187/1280 3.00 4.32 4.10 4.14 3.00 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 2 2 2 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.31 4.39 3.63 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 1 0 2 2 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.31 4.39 3.63 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 1 0 2 1 0 0 1.67 ***/ 228 *** *** 4.35 4.29 *** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 0 1.67 ***/ 228 *** 4.35 4.29 *** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ***/ 79 *** 4.67 4.58 4.53 *** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ***/ 78 *** 4.48 4.52 4.30 *** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ***/ 78 *** 4.38 4.45 4.34 *** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 47 *** 4.38 4.45 4.34 *** Field Work 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 2.50 ***/ 47 *** 4.38 4.45 4.34 *** Field Work 3. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 39 *** 4.40 4.68 *** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 34 *** *** 4.40 4.68 *** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 37 *** 4.40 4.68 *** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 37 *** 4.40 4.68 *** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 37 *** 4.40 4.68 *** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 37 *** 4.40 4.68 *** 4. Was the fe	-	4	0				1	4							
Discussion Discus															
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		4	7	4											
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1187/1280 3.00 4.32 4.10 4.14 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.00 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 2 2 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.31 4.39 3.63 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 1 0 2 1 3 3.71 604/854 3.71 4.05 4.02 4.00 3.71 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 ***/ 228 **** *** 4.35 4.29 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ***/ 77 *** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0.00 2.00 ***/ 77 *** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0.00 2.00 ***/ 78 **** 4.38 4.45 4.34 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 1 1 1 2 3 4.00 930/1277 4.00 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.00 3.01d the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 2 2 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.31 4.39 3.63 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 1 0 2 1 3 3.71 604/854 3.71 4.05 4.02 4.00 3.71 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.29 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 0 0.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.58 4.53 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.75 4.49 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.38 4.45 4.34 **** Eigld Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 0 1 0 0 0 0.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.44 4.56 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 33 **** 4.43 4.54 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 37 **** 4.44 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.67 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** *****	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 2 2 1 1 3 3.63 1089/1269 3.63 4.54 4.31 4.39 3.63 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 1 0 2 1 3 3.71 604/854 3.71 4.05 4.02 4.00 3.71 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.29 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.58 4.53 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.75 4.49 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** 4.41 4.56 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.64 4.75 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.69 4.75 *****	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.00
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.29 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.58 4.53 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 8 **** 4.35 4.29 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 8 **** 4.38 4.51 4.34 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 47 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** 4.31 4.26 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 37 **** 4.40 4.68 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 37 **** 4.41 4.56 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 37 **** 4.41 4.26 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 38 **** 4.30 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.69 4.75 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.64 ***** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 ***** **** 4.64 ************	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.00
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 ****/ 228 **** **** 4.35 4.29 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.58 4.53 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.75 4.49 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 2.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 47 **** 4.41 4.56 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ***/ 45 **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ***/ 35 **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 37 **** 4.30 4.12 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 23 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 22 *** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ***/ 22 *** **** 4.51 **** ****	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1089/1269	3.63	4.54	4.31	4.39	3.63
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.58 4.53 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.75 4.49 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 8 **** 4.38 4.45 4.34 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	604/ 854	3.71	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.71
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.58 4.53 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.75 4.49 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 8 **** 4.38 4.45 4.34 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	T. Armada and														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	-	1 2	0	2	0	1	0	0	1 67	****/ 220	****	****	/ 2E	4 20	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19. Did such presentation with the instructor helpful 19. Did such presentation with the ins	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	U	2	U	1	U	U	1.07	/ 220			4.33	4.29	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.88 4.52 4.30 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.75 4.49 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.38 4.45 4.34 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****	Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.75 4.49 4.33 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.38 4.45 4.34 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 78 **** 4.38 4.45 4.34 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 4.11 3.33 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** *** 4.54 **** **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** *** 4.54 **** ****	2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2.50 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.61 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.33	****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 0.50 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****	4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** **** 4.54 **** ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 47 **** **** 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 **** 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** **** 4.54 **** ****															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****			_	_			_								
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 ****	-						-	-		,					
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 1. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 1. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 ****								-		, -					
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.12 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.61 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 ****							-	-							
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 ****							-	-		,					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.63 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 ****	Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 23 **** **** 4.41 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****		14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****			•	•				0		, ,,	****	****			****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 22 **** **** 4.54 **** ****								-		,	****	****		4.75	****
			-			-	-	0		, 55	****	****			****
5. Were there enough procedus for all the students 14 0 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 mm/ 10 mm 4.49 mm 4.49	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	1	0	0	0		,	****	****	4.49	***	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101
Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 739 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101 Title

METHOD OF INTERPRETATI

Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 5

Baltimore County Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Page 740 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies						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	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.57	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.80
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	4.44	4.25	4.26	4.34	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	4.67	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	4.72	4.37	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1412	4.89	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	4.83	4.36	4.08	4.21	5.00
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1500	4.56	4.10	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How man	y times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.74	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.60
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.21	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instru	actor's lecture	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	4.75	4.32	4.45	4.52	5.00
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00						1/1448	4.94	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00		
3. Was lec	ture mat	erial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00						5.00	1/1436	4.56	4.31	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned							5.00	1/1432	4.75	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1							5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.73	3.93	4.04	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	4.83	4.32	4.10	4.28	5.00
2. Were al	l studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	4.75	4.52	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	5.00
Frequency Distribution																		
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	s Reasons								Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0						Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	Required for Majors													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0						0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	0	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0							3				-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_j h		
				P 0	Electives						respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			
				I O	Other 5					5	-							
				? 0	Otner :													

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0201 University of Maryland Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 741

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10

Instructor:

Ouestionnaires: 9

FERNANDEZ, JEAN

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

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 1 4 4 4.33 814/1522 4.57 4.17 4.30 4.42 4.33 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 1 4 3.89 1200/1522 4.44 4.25 4.26 4.34 3.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 706/1285 4.67 4.32 4.30 4.42 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 566/1476 4.72 4.37 4.22 4.31 4.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 155/1412 4.89 4.13 4.06 4.11 4.78 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 207/1381 4.83 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 2 0 6 4.11 924/1500 4.56 4.10 4.18 4.25 4.11 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 532/1517 4.74 4.47 4.65 4.71 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 1 1 3 2 3.86 1073/1497 4.43 4.22 4.11 4.21 3.86 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 798/1440 4.75 4.32 4.45 4.52 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 575/1448 4.94 4.71 4.71 4.75 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 987/1436 4.56 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.13 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 632/1432 4.75 4.27 4.29 4.34 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 286/1280 4.83 4.32 4.10 4.28 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 594/1277 4.75 4.52 4.34 4.50 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 461/1269 4.83 4.54 4.31 4.49 4.67

Frequency Distribution

3 4 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 854 5.00 4.05 4.02 4.31 ****

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

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101 University of Maryla
Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY Baltimore County
Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

9

University of Maryland Page 742
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 492/1522 4.55 4.17 4.30 4.42 4.6 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 0 4 4.40 702/1522 4.20 4.25 4.26 4.34 4.4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 0 3 4.25 766/1285 3.88 4.32 4.30 4.42 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 178/1476 4.30 4.37 4.22 4.31 4.8 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 167/1412 4.63 4.13 4.06 4.11 4.7 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 178/1476 4.30 4.37 4.22 4.31 4.8 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 118/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 1161/1517 4.53 4.74 4.65 4.71 4.4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1490 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1420 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 4.29 4.32 4.8 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1420 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 492/1522 4.55 4.17 4.30 4.42 4.6 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 0 4 4.40 702/1522 4.20 4.25 4.26 4.34 4.4 4.0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 0 4 4.40 702/1522 4.20 4.25 4.26 4.34 4.4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 0 3 4.25 766/1285 3.88 4.32 4.30 4.42 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 178/1476 4.30 4.37 4.22 4.31 4.8 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 167/1412 4.63 4.13 4.06 4.11 4.7 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.07 4.65 4.71 4.4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.07 4.65 4.71 4.5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.0 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2			 Genera	1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 0 4 4.40 702/1522 4.20 4.25 4.26 4.34 4.4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 0 3 4.25 766/1285 3.88 4.32 4.30 4.42 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 178/1476 4.30 4.37 4.22 4.31 4.8 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 167/1412 4.63 4.13 4.06 4.11 4.7 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.07 4.65 4.71 4.4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 14 4.80 18/1381 4.57 4.36 4.07 4.65 4.71 4.5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.0 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2	1. Did vo	ou gain ne		-	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1522	4.55	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 0 3 4.25 766/1285 3.88 4.32 4.30 4.42 4.2 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 178/1476 4.30 4.37 4.22 4.31 4.8 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 167/1412 4.63 4.13 4.06 4.11 4.7 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 118/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 118/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 116/1500 4.32 4.10 4.18 4.25 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 5.00 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.0 **Lecture** **Lecture**	_	_				0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	702/1522	4.20	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 .80 178/1476 4.30 4.37 4.22 4.31 4.8 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 167/1412 4.63 4.13 4.06 4.11 4.7 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 118/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 160/1500 4.32 4.10 4.18 4.25 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 160/1500 4.32 4.10 4.18 4.25 4.8 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1442 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.32 4.34 4.05 5.0 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1422 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 0.0 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 0.0 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 0.0 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 0.0 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 0.0 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 0.0 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	766/1285		4.32		4.42	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 167/1412 4.63 4.13 4.06 4.11 4.76 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 118/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 160/1500 4.32 4.10 4.18 4.25 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 1161/1517 4.53 4.47 4.65 4.71 4.4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0		_			_	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.30	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 118/1381 4.57 4.36 4.08 4.21 4.8 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 160/1500 4.32 4.10 4.18 4.25 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 1161/1517 4.53 4.47 4.65 4.71 4.4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 1 d. hinstructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 1 d. hinstructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 1 d. hinstructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 217/1436 4.40 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.8 4.5 1 d. hinstructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1428 4.80 4.27 4.29 4.34 4.5 1 d. hinstructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1428 4.80 4.27 4.29 4.34 4.5 1 d. hinstructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1428 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1428 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1428 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem shance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem shance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem shance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem shance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem shance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem shance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5 d. hinstructor seem shance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1220 4.83 3.73 3.93 4						1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.63		4.06	4.11	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 160/1500 4.32 4.10 4.18 4.25 4.8 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 1161/1517 4.53 4.47 4.65 4.71 4.4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 217/1436 4.40 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.8 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1422 4.80 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.81 4.90 4.31 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.81 4.90 4.31 4.29 4.34 5.0 5.0 1/1432 4.81 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.91 4.9		_	_		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1381	4.57	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 1161/1517 4.53 4.47 4.65 4.71 4.49 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1497 4.75 4.22 4.11 4.21 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.47 4.71 4.75 5.0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 217/1436 4.40 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.8 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1221 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 5.0 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1221 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1270 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00			-		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500		4.10	4.18	4.25	4.80
Lecture Lect						0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40					4.71	4.40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 217/1436 4.40 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.50 4.50 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1		-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1440 4.25 4.32 4.45 4.52 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 217/1436 4.40 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.50 4.50 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1448 4.83 4.71 4.71 4.75 5.0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 217/1436 4.40 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.8 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1221 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1277 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Erequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 5 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5	1 Word +1	ho inatr			nronarod	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	E 00	1/1/1/0	4 25	1 22	1 15	4 52	E 00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 217/1436 4.40 4.31 4.29 4.32 4.84 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1221 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1277 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 5 OO-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5						0	-	•		•	-								
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1432 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.34 5.0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1221 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1277 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Erequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5					3	0								,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1221 4.83 3.73 3.93 4.04 5.0 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1277 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 5 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5			_		-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_							
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1277 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1280 4.75 4.32 4.10 4.28 5.0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1277 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Erequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 5 0 0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					U	3	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/1221	4.83	3./3	3.93	4.04	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1277 4.67 4.52 4.34 4.50 5.0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1269 4.42 4.54 4.31 4.49 5.0 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5	1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.75	4.32	4.10	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/854 4.33 4.05 4.02 4.31 5.0 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5	2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	4.67	4.52	4.34	4.50	5.00
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5	3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.42	4.54	4.31	4.49	5.00
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5	4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	4.33	4.05	4.02	4.31	5.00
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5							Dist	trib	ution	ı									
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 5		-	1																
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades Reasons									Туј	pe			Majors	\$	
	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	;	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2	28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			-			•						3 -		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 0 Under-grad 5 Non-major 0	56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1					Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	major	0
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		1		1	D 0									3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough		0		0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ιh
P 0 responses to be significant					P 0	BICCCIVCS										_			
I O Other 4					I 0		Other					4	-						

? 0

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0201 University of Maryla
Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY Baltimore County
Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY Spring 2007

I

?

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

8

University of Maryland Page 743
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

6

C+udon+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

		0	_		NTD	3.7.7		equei 2		3 4	_		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	s 		NK	NA	1		3	-4 		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	1	1	4	4.50	605/1522	4.55	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1080/1522		4.25	4.26	4.34	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	4	0	1	0	0	1		1160/1285		4.32	4.30	4.42	3.50
	_	uations reflect		-	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1174/1476	4.30	4.37	4.22	4.31	3.80
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	339/1412	4.63	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.50
6. Did wi	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	519/1381	4.57	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.33
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1129/1500	4.32	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.83
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	932/1517	4.53	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.67
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	385/1497	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.50
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	1	0	1	3	1		1359/1440		4.32		4.52	3.50
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	1	0	5		1001/1448		4.71	4.71	4.75	4.67
				xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	0	4		1056/1436		4.31		4.32	4.00
		es contribute t		-	0	0	1	0	1	0	4		1036/1432			4.29	4.34	4.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	175/1221	4.83	3.73	3.93	4.04	4.67
		B!																
1 544 -		Discus		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.50	390/1280	4.75	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.50
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	3		743/1277		4.52	4.10	4.50	4.33
		-	_	d to participate d open discussion	0	0	0	1	7	0	3	3.83	989/1269		4.54	4.34	4.49	3.83
		echniques succe		a open arscussion	0	3	0	0	2	0		3.67				4.02		3.67
T. WELE	special c	ecinitques succe	ssiui		U	,	U	U	2	U	_	3.07	023/ 034	1.33	4.03	1.02	1.31	3.07
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons							Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		a		,				0	TT		_	37		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								0			1			1.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives					0	#### - :				_	ın		
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	Ιτ	

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 410A 0101
Title FORMALIST POETRY
Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA

10

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 744 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

						Fre	equer	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. D	id vou gair	n new insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.42	5.00
		tructor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.26	4.34	5.00
		m questions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00
		valuations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.31	5.00
		d readings contrib		1 3	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00
	_	3		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.78
		ding system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.10	4.18	4.25	4.67
		mes was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1037/1517	4.56	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.56
	-			ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.22	4.11	4.21	5.00
_		Lectur	_	_	_		_	_	_	_	_							
		structor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.52	5.00
		tructor seem inter		3	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00
		material presente			1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.31	4.29	4.32	5.00
		tures contribute t		-	1	0 7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00
5. D:	id audiovi:	sual techniques en	niques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	***	3.73	3.93	4.04	****
		Discus	gion															
1 D	id class d	iscussions contrib		what you learned	3	0	0	0	Ο	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.28	5.00
		udents actively en		_	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.83
		_	_	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.67
		l techniques succe		a open arbeabbion	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	5.00
	apro												_,					
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Ty										pe			Majors	3			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3												^			0			
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2					Red	quire	eu I	OT Mg	Jors	5	0	Graduate	=	0	Majo)T	8
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 2					Cos	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad.	9	Mos	major	1
		5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0					пста.	L				4	onder-g.	Lau	J	NOII-	iiia jul	_
	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 1					. רק	ectiv	700				0	#### - I	Meane +	hara a	re not	anous	rh
Gra	u. 0	3.30-4.00	ی	P 1		11.1	CCCI	(CD				U	response				_	1++
I 0						∩ +1	hor					6	T ESPONS!	בס נט ג	e sign	ııııcaı.		
				Ι 0	Other 6							O						

?

0

Course-Section: ENGL 410B 0101 University of Maryland Title LEARNING & HUMAN INTER Baltimore County Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER Spring 2007

niversity of Maryland Page 745
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

	Evaluation	

			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	2	2	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.10	4.18	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1268/1517	4.25	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1331/1440	3.67	4.32	4.45	4.52	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	1		1064/1221	3.00	3.73	3.93	4.04	3.00
Diamondon.														
Discussion	0	0	^	0	^	1	2	4 75	000/1000	4 75	4 20	4 10	4 00	4 75
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	Τ	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.32	4.10	4.28 4.50	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	3	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.52	4.34		4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00 4.50	1/1269 194/ 854	5.00 4.50	4.54	4.31	4.49 4.31	5.00 4.50
4. were special techniques successful	U	U	U	U	Т	U	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.50
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtion	n									

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

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN Enrollment:

11 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 746

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4 11	1043/1522	4.11	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4		1080/1522	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.42	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	392/1381	4.44	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	1	3		1298/1500	3.50	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	756/1497	4.17	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1112/1440	4.17	4.32	4.45	4.52	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.14	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıtio	า									
11040		2100			-									

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

Course-Section: ENGL 473 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV CREATIVE WRTG:POET

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Page 747 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	n Questi	lonnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	211/1522	4.86	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	265/1476	4.71	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1136/1381	3.57	4.36	4.08	4.21	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1415/1500	3.14	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.32	4.45	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	845/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	956/1221	3.40	3.73	3.93	4.04	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.50
i. Mere preside deciminates passessial	_	_	Ü	ŭ	Ū	_	_	1.50	131, 031	1.50	1.00	1.02	1.51	1.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	65/ 79	4.33	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.88	4.52	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	64/ 78	4.00	4.38	4.45	4.58	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.14	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 486 0101

Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO

Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Page 748 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

		0			•	373		_	ncies		-		ructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	s 		NR 	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/152	2 4.88	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.88
		tor make clear	_	_	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	545/152		4.25	4.26	4.34	4.50
		estions reflec			0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/128			4.30	4.42	5.00
		ations reflect	-		0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	406/147		4.37	4.22	4.31	4.57
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/141		4.13	4.06	4.11	4.88
		-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/138		4.36	4.08	4.21	4.75
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	4 5	4.25	780/150		4.10	4.18	4.25	4.25
	-	was class canc		ing offostiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5 4	4.63	973/151 333/149			4.65 4.11	4.71 4.21	4.63 4.57
9. HOW WOL	uia you g.	rade the overa	II teaci	ning effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	3	4	4.57	333/149	/ 4.5/	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.57
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1124/144	0 4.14	4.32	4.45	4.52	4.14
		tor seem inter		2	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/144	8 5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	845/143	6 4.29	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.29
		s contribute t			1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	558/143			4.29	4.34	4.57
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	500/122	1 4.20	3.73	3.93	4.04	4.20
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	253/128	0 4.71	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.71
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/127			4.34	4.50	4.86
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/126			4.31	4.49	4.86
		chniques succe			1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	426/ 85				4.31	4.00
		Semina	r															
1			L - L1		4	0	0	0	0	0	4	F 00	1 / 17	0 5 00	4 67	4 50	4 67	F 00
	_	-		announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0 1	4	5.00 4.75	1/ 7 45/ 7		4.67 4.88	4.58 4.52	4.67 4.60	5.00 4.75
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 6		4.88	4.52	4.60	4.75
	_	ns contribute		_	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 7		4.75	4.45	4.58	4.75
_		or grading mad		you rearned	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.73	40/ 8			4.11	4.14	4.73
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
				_	_													
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			T;	уре 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradua	te	2	Majo	or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														
56-83 84-150	1	2.00-2.99	0 1	C 1 D 0		Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-	grad	6	Non-	-major	2
84-150 Grad.	2	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	5	Б 0 F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enoue	rh
			-	P 0										ses to			_	•
				I 0		Oth	ıer					6						

University of Maryland Page 749
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 493 0101

15

SEMINAR IN CT

MAHER, JENNIFER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

							Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1338/152	2 3.67	4.17	4.30	4.42	3.67
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1303/152	2 3.67	4.25	4.26	4.34	3.67
		estions reflect	_	_	1	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1065/128	5 3.80	4.32	4.30	4.42	3.80
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the expe	ected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	792/147	6 4.25	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.25
. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	0	1	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	916/141	2 3.88	4.13	4.06	4.11	3.88
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1252/138	1 3.22	4.36	4.08	4.21	3.2
		g system clearly	_	ned	0	1	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1298/150	0 3.50	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.5
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	6	3		1217/151			4.65	4.71	4.33
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	ll teachi	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	898/149	7 4.00	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.00
		Lecture	9															
l. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	s well pi	repared	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1359/144	0 3.50	4.32	4.45	4.52	3.50
		ctor seem intere		-	3	0	0	0	0	2	4		1001/144		4.71	4.71	4.75	4.6
		terial presented			3	0	1	0	2	1	2		1282/143		4.31	4.29	4.32	3.50
		es contribute to	_		3	1	1	2	0	0	2		1364/143			4.29	4.34	3.00
Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance you	ır understanding	3	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	759/122	1 3.80	3.73	3.93	4.04	3.8
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu			3	0	2	0	2	0	2		1187/128		4.32	4.10	4.28	3.00
		nts actively end	_		3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	594/127			4.34	4.50	4.50
		_		open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	828/126		4.54	4.31	4.49	4.1
ł. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sstul		3	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	426/ 85	4 4.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.00
		Seminar			_				_		_					4 = 0		
	_	copics relevant			7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 7	_	4.67	4.58	4.67	***
				vidual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 7	-	4.88	4.52	4.60	***
3. Did res	search pr	rojects contribu	ite to wh	nat you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 6	5 ****	4.75	4.49	4.65	***
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute t	o what	you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 7	8 ****	4.38	4.45	4.58	***
. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 8	0 ****	4.33	4.11	4.14	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Т	ype			Majors	}
 00-27	 0	 0.00-0.99	0	A 3		 Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior		0	 Gradua	 te	 0	Majo	 or	 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		100	-1011	ca I	O1 140	المارد	_	•	Grada		J	1100	-	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-	grad	9	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													3	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 1		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means	there a	are not	enou	ſh
				P 0										ses to 1			_	
				I 0		Ot	her					7	_		_			
				? 2														