Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 692 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101

COMPOSITION

DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Title

Instructor:

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	754/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.41
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	425/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.59
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	kpected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	367/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	2	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	597/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.40
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	281/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.59
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	298/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.59
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	398/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	4.59
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	2	18	2		1497/1635		4.32	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How wo	uld you s	grade the overal	l teacl	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	312/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.58
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	602/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.67
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	546/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	239/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.81
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	401/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.71
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	1	13	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	753/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.88
		Discuss	si on															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	329/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.67
				d to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	489/1391		4.39	4.30	4.07	4.67
					4	0	0	0	0	1	17		134/1388		4.47	4.28	4.01	
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussic Were special techniques successful					2	2	2	3	2	7		674/ 958		3.83		3.71	
		Laborat	orv															
2. Were y	ou provid		_	ground information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
		Seminar	2															
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	***
		Field V	Jork															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribut	e to wl	nat you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand you	ır evalı	uation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced			what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
	_	cions make clear		_	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00		4.67	****
				Frequ	iencv	Dist	rib	utio	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	son	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0						,
Grad.						EΙθ	ectiv	ves				0	#### -				_	ın
P 0						O+1	201-					7	respons	es to k	be sign	ııııcar	ıt	
	I 0 ? 3					OEI	ner					/						
				: 3														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301 University of Maryland Page 693
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	20	
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque:	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. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1138/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	926/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.19
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	950/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.06
4. Did ot	her evalı	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	862/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.19
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	774/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o what you learne	d 0	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	514/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.38
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	1	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1289/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.73
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.94
9. How wo	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectivenes	s 4	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	841/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.08
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were ti	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	10	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1237/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.00
		ctor seem inter	-		10	0	0	1	1	1	3		1414/1520			4.70	4.61	4.00
					10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	,		4.24	4.27	4.20	4.17
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				10	0	0	2	0	1	3		1198/1550		4.17	4.22	4.17	3.83
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi:				9	2	0	2	2	1	0		1213/1295		3.42			2.80
		-	-	_														
		Discus																
				what you learned	12		0	0	1	0	3		426/1398		4.20	4.07	3.85	4.50
				d to participate	12		0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1391		4.39	4.30	4.07	4.25
				d open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	3		387/1388		4.47	4.28	4.01	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		12	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	****
				Fre	quency	y Dis	strib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	s 1	.0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			-											
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ge	enera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	_j h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0					Ot	her					3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501 University of Maryland Page 694 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 26

Enrollment:	26			
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4 08	1089/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.08
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	170/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.85
		uestions reflec		_	0	7	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	517/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.50
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	363/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.62
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	598/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.23
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	306/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.58
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.69
	-	was class cand		.11104	0	0	0	0	0	12	1		1466/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.08
	-			hing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.71
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	454/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.75
		ctor seem inter		3	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.92
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	141/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.92
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	253/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.83
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	505/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.20
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dicc			what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	5.00
				ed to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	3		393/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.75
		-	_	d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3		387/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.75
		echniques succe		a open albeablion	9	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	****
	_	1																
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	}			
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5							ed f	 от М			 9	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55						Ke	quii	eu I	OT M	ع ال	۵	J	Graduati	5	U	Majo) <u>T</u>	U
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 2					Ce	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	13
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					GE	ııcıa	_				J	onder -g.	Luu 1		INOII-	iia jui	± 3
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					EJ.	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoud	rh
P 0						יבני	CCCI	v C D				J	respons				_	111
	P 0 I 0					Ot.	her					4	10050110					
				1 0		O C.	TICI					7						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701 University of Maryland Page 695
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 25

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questionnaires: 24

O combiners							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	 1															
1 Did vo	nı dəin n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	1	0	4	8	R	4 05	1110/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.05
_	-	ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	567/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.48
		uestions reflec		-	4	16	0	0	0	1	3		****/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	****
	_	uations reflect		_	4	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	741/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	4.30
				what you learned	3	1	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	700/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	4.10
	-	-		o what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	313/1504		4.30	4.05	3.78	4.57
		g system clearl		_	4	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	756/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	4.30
		was class canc			3	0	0	0	3	15	3	4.00	1497/1635		4.32	4.65	4.56	4.00
				hing effectiveness	9	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	646/1579		4.05	4.08	3.95	4.27
		Lectur																
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared in the subject					0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	602/1518		4.30	4.43	4.38	4.67
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	546/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	371/1517		4.24	4.27	4.20	4.70
		es contribute t		-	3	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	511/1550		4.17	4.22	4.17	4.62
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	265/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.50
		D																
1 Did al		Discus		what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	4	0	4.38	525/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.38
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	1	4 6	8	4.38	710/1398	4.10	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.38
		_	_	d to participate	11	0	0	1	0	2	6 10	4.58	558/1388	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.38
		echniques succe		d open discussion	11	1	1	0	0	8	3	4.02	456/ 958		3.83	3.93	3.71	
1. Wele s	special co	ecinitques succe	BBLUI		11			U	U	O	J	4.00	430/ 330	3.30	3.03	3.93	3.71	1.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utior	n									
Condite D		Expected Grades				Das		_			m				M = = = = = =			
creaits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								ason	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 9 0.00-0.99 0 A 12					Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	-major	23
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
			P 0															

Other

0

I

?

0

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801 University of Maryland Page 696
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quantitative and			Fre	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0		_	-	_	_	2 00	1500/1600	2 50	4 05	4 05	4 00	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	7	5	3		1599/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0 10	1 2	4	, 6	5	4 0		1536/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	-		1	2	9	1 6	-		1394/1397		4.25		4.18	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	6	6	4		1427/1583	4.15 3.84	4.22	4.19 4.01	4.01	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	7	6		1465/1532 1212/1504	4.18	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	5	4	4	6		1455/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.10	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	6	6	1		1460/1579	4.00	4.05	4.03	3.95	3.12
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	2	2	U	U	_	3.12	1400/13/9	1.00	4.03	4.00	3.93	3.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	3	5	3	6	3.30	1453/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	3	8	6	3.80	1457/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	11	4	1	2.95	1464/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	2.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	5	6	2	2.90	1464/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	2.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1270/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	4	4	1	2.59	1350/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	6	2	2	3	4	2.82	1358/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	2.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	3	2	5	3		1320/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	4	2	1	2	1	2.40	928/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
Quantum con														
Seminar	0.1	0	0	0	0	1	^	4 00	****/ OF	****	4 07	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21 21	0	0	0	0 1	1	0		****/ 85 ****/ 82	****	4.27	4.58 4.52	4.50 4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 82	****		4.16	3.90	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	21	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/ 02		3.01	4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****
• • •														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR

26

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 696 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 697
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901

25

COMPOSITION

FINDLAY, JOANNE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	10	6	2 06	1289/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	12	4.24	,		4.05	4.27	4.17	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	1	2	6	4.24	850/1397		4.05	4.28	4.18	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	741/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	2	11		1035/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	14	4.19	667/1504		4.30	4.05	3.78	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	982/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	3	6	7	5	0		1627/1635		4.32	4.65	4.56	2.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	4	4	6		783/1579		4.05	4.08		4.14
Logtumo														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	4	10	4 20	1077/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	979/1520		4.71	4.43	4.30	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	1	3	11	4.22	917/1517	4.24	4.71	4.70	4.20	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	3	11	4.17	972/1550		4.17	4.22	4.17	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	0	2	2	5	4.00			3.42	3.94		4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	7	,	1	U	2	2	5	1.00	023/1293	3.30	3.42	3.74	3.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	2	12	4.11	735/1398		4.20	4.07	3.85	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84			4.39	4.30	4.07	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84			4.47	4.28	4.01	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	267/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,		3.70	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		3.97	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82		3.64	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work							_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,		4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42		4.42	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 697 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001 Title COMPOSITION Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Field Work

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

Page 698 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1252/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	1021/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	795/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	548/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	419/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	404/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	1016/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	13	6	0	3.25	1610/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	569/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.33
Lecture	-	0	-	0	0		1.0	4 40	0.45 /1510	4 21	4 20	4 40	4 20	4 40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Ι	0	Τ	0	2	4	13	4.40	947/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	20	4.95	273/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	474/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	677/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	Λ	Λ	2	2	10	4.57	386/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	507/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	n	3	4	4	3.83	563/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.83
i. Mere apeciar recimitanca anccesarur	,	2		U	J	1	-	5.05	303/ 930	3.30	5.05	5.95	5.71	5.05

Frequency Distribution

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101 University of Maryland

Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 699 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	1588/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	1		1481/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	0		1268/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1406/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1402/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1212/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	2	0		1564/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	4	2	0		1625/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	2.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1420/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1496/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	1	0		1482/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1440/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1342/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1370/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1292/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51		****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101 University of Maryland Page 699 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101 University of Maryland Page 700
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

OSITION Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 26

Ouestionnaires: 8

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 5 2 0 3.13 1588/1639 3.78 4.05 4.27 4.08 3.13 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 5 2 1 3.50 1481/1639 4.14 4.09 4.22 4.17 3.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1268/1397 4.00 4.25 4.28 4.18 3.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 3.50 1406/1583 4.15 4.22 4.19 4.01 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1402/1532 3.84 4.02 4.01 3.88 3.13 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 4 0 3.50 1212/1504 4.18 4.30 4.05 3.78 3.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 4 2 2 0 2.75 1564/1612 3.91 3.88 4.16 4.10 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 1 4 2 0 2.88 1625/1635 4.00 4.32 4.65 4.56 2.88 Lecture 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $7 \ 0 \ 0$ 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly $6 \ 0 \ 0$ 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1520 4.67 4.71 4.70 4.61 4.83 0 1 1 0 3.50 1347/1517 4.24 4.24 4.27 4.20 3.15 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 1440/1550 4.07 4.17 4.22 4.17 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 2 1 2 0 2.67 1342/1398 4.01 4.20 4.07 3.85 2.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 2 0 0 3 1 3.17 1292/1388 4.37 4.47 4.28 4.01 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 1 2 1 0 0 2.00 937/ 958 3.50 3.83 3.93 3.71 2.00 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.25 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $7 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 00 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 0 1 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 37 **** 3.80 4.58 5.00 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.00 4.56 4.60 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 50 **** 5.00 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 5.00 4.51 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make creat the chiper 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 43 **** 5.00 4.69 4.69 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 5.00 4.37 4.67 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons

 00-27
 3
 0.00-0.99
 0
 A
 4

 28-55
 0
 1.00-1.99
 0
 B
 3

 56-83
 0
 2.00-2.99
 0
 C
 0

 Required for Majors 5 Graduate 0 Major 0 General Under-grad 8 Non-maior 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

I 0 Other 3 ? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201 Title COMPOSITION Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE Fall 2007

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 701

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies		_		tructor		e Dept			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1042/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	4.63
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	4	1		1238/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	3.63
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	476/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	580/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	4.25
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	367/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.50
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1399/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1350/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.25
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1079/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.88
	-																	
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.71
2. Did the	old the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.86
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clear:					0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.71
4. Did the	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.00
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				1	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1247/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.50
		Discus																
				what you learned	4		0	1	1	1	1		1106/1398			4.07	3.85	3.50
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1321/1391		4.39	4.30	4.07	3.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.00
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.00
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5		_				<i>J</i> . ~						5		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	General							J				-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0					0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh		
				P 0	210001100						respons							
				I 0	Other					3	-							
	I 0																	

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301

26

COMPOSITION

SCHMIDT, VIRGIN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Page 702 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions							_	ncie	s			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1428/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.65
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	667/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.41
		uestions reflec	_	_	1	10	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.17
	_	uations reflect			0	1	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	726/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	4.31
				what you learned	1	0	3	1	4	2	6	3.44	1282/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	3.44
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12		230/1504		4.30	4.05	3.78	4.69
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1044/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1475/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.06
				ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	725/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.20
1 Were th	he instri	Lecture		repared	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.80
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject				12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00
	s lecture material presented and explained clearl				12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	5.00
					11	0	0	1	0	2	3		972/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22		4.17
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin				11	1	0	1	1	3	0		1035/1295		3.42	3.94		3.40
J. Dia aa	alovibua	r cccimiiques em	idirec 7	our underbedinging		_	J	_	_	3	J	3.10	1033, 1233	3.30	3.12	3.71	3.01	3.10
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were a	.11 studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Onedita D		Character CDA		The same of Consider				ъ.		_			m				M =	
	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							ке	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 2				Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17	
84-150																		
Grad.	0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0					Ot	her					4						
				? 0	Other													

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401 University of Maryland FEB 13, 2008 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 BROFMAN, MARGAR Instructor: Enrollment: 25

Page 703

Questionnaires:	17	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1541/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	1193/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.94
		uestions reflec		-	0	3	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	1160/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.79
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	919/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.13
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	5	3	4	1	4	2.76	1475/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.76
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	824/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	965/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.12
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.94
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	6	5	3	3.60	1270/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.60
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1220/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.06
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	1264/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.41
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	4	8	3.94	1142/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.94
4. Did th					0	0	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	1204/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.82
5. Did au	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				0	13	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	958/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.77
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	4	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	1141/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.77
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	925/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.08
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	4	5	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.50
				Frequ	ency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors			
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra									, 								
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83						Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives							1	#### - 1				_	ſh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Other						5						

University of Maryland Page 704
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501

25

COMPOSITION

WILKINSON, RACH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

					Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you ga	in new insights,skill	s from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	443/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.65
	structor make clear t		0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	128/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	4.90
	cam questions reflect		0	11	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	261/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	4.78
	evaluations reflect t		0	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	307/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	4.68
	ed readings contribut	1 3	1	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	190/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	4.74
		ute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	182/1504		4.30	4.05	3.78	4.75
	ading system clearly		0	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50			3.88	4.16	4.10	4.50
	imes was class cancel		0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80			4.32	4.65	4.56	4.80
-		teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60			4.05	4.08	3.95	4.60
	Tashiin															
1 Were the i	Lecture .nstructor's lectures	well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	575/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.69
	structor seem interes		4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	776/1520		4.71	4.70	4.61	4.81
		and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	405/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.67
	ectures contribute to		4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	351/1550			4.27		4.75
		-			1	0		2					4.17		4.17	
o. Dia audiov	risuai tecnniques enna	nce your understanding	5	4	Τ	U	2	2	6	4.09	581/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.09
	Discussi															
	discussions contribut		9	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	403/1398		4.20	4.07	3.85	4.55
	students actively enco		9	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.82
		ir and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	533/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.64
4. Were speci	al techniques success	ful	9	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	201/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.50
	Self Pa	ced														
1. Did self-r	aced system contribut	e to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	***	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
	questions make clear		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	5.00	4.51	4.67	***
	contacts with the ins		19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	***	5.00	4.69	4.69	***
	edback/tutoring by pr		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
	e enough proctors for		19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21		5.00	4.52	5.00	***
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earne	ed Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Po	asons	,			Π.,	pe			Majors	
Earlie	cuiii. GPA							- 			ту					, . – – – –
00-27 10		2 A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55		0 B 10 0 C 1		0		1				0	IIndos -		20	Mon	ma i a	20
56-83 (84-150 (0 C 1 0 D 0		Gei	nera	Т				U	Under-g	rau 2	20	Non-	-major	20
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 Elect										1	#### -				_	βh
		P 0 I 0		Ot1	her					5	respons	es to k	oe sign	ııııcar	1T	
		0 0														

?

0

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Fall 2007

Page 705

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

MACEK, PHILIP Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601

COMPOSITION

Title

Instructor:

Cor Rank 7/1639 1/1639 7/1397 5/1583	Mean 3.78 4.14 4.00			Level Mean	Sect Mear
7/1639 1/1639 7/1397 5/1583	3.78 3.78 4.14 4.00	4.05		Mean	Mear
1/1639 7/1397 5/1583	4.14 4.00		4.27		
1/1639 7/1397 5/1583	4.14 4.00		4.27		
1/1639 7/1397 5/1583	4.14 4.00			4.08	3.50
7/1397 5/1583	4.00		4.22	4.17	4.14
5/1583			4.28	4.18	4.38
)/1532	4.15		4.19	4.01	4.50
	3.84		4.01	3.88	3.40
5/1504			4.05	3.78	4.09
7/1612			4.16	4.10	3.95
					4.36
			4.08		4.12
ι/151Ω	4 21	4 30	4 43	4 30	4.29
					4.44
					4.29
3/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.7
					3.82
					4.59
					4.72
*/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	***
*/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	***
*/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	***
·/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	***
*/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	***
*/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	***

,					***
		3.80	4.58	5.00	***
∗/ 5∩	****	5 00	4 45	4 54	***
,					***

, -5	•	5.00			***
,	=				***
, 21	- "	5.00	1.24	5.00	
Ty	тре			Majors	3
8	8/1579 1/1518 9/1520 3/1550 8/1295 0/1398 7/1391 3/1388 */ 958 */ 240 */ 85 */ 82 */ 37 */ 52 */ 32 */ 32 */ 32 */ 32 */ 32 */ 32 */ 32 */ 32	8/1579	8/1579 4.00 4.05 1/1518 4.31 4.30 9/1520 4.67 4.71 3/1517 4.24 4.24 7/1550 4.07 4.17 8/1295 3.50 3.42 0/1398 4.01 4.20 7/1391 4.10 4.39 3/1388 4.37 4.47 */ 958 3.50 3.83 */ 240 **** **** */ 85 **** 4.27 */ 80 **** 3.97 */ 82 **** 3.64 */ 52 **** 4.48 */ 53 **** 4.18 */ 42 **** 4.42 */ 37 **** 3.80 */ 50 **** 5.00 */ 32 **** 5.00 */ 32 **** 5.00 */ 21 **** 5.00 */ 21 **** 5.00	8/1579 4.00 4.05 4.08 1/1518 4.31 4.30 4.43 9/1520 4.67 4.71 4.70 3/1517 4.24 4.24 4.27 7/1550 4.07 4.17 4.22 8/1295 3.50 3.42 3.94 0/1398 4.01 4.20 4.07 7/1391 4.10 4.39 4.30 3/1388 4.37 4.47 4.28 */ 958 3.50 3.83 3.93 */ 240 **** **** 4.11 */ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 */ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 */ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 */ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 */ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 */ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 */ 37 **** 3.80 4.58 */ 50 **** 5.00 4.51 */ 43 **** 5.00 4.51 */ 43 **** 5.00 4.52 */ 32 **** 5.00 4.52 */ 31 **** 5.00 4.52	8/1579 4.00 4.05 4.08 3.95 1/1518 4.31 4.30 4.43 4.38 9/1520 4.67 4.71 4.70 4.61 3/1517 4.24 4.24 4.27 4.20 7/1550 4.07 4.17 4.22 4.17 8/1295 3.50 3.42 3.94 3.84 0/1398 4.01 4.20 4.07 3.85 7/1391 4.10 4.39 4.30 4.07 3/1388 4.37 4.47 4.28 4.01 */ 958 3.50 3.83 3.93 3.71 */ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 */ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 */ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 */ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 */ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 */ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 */ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 */ 37 **** 3.80 4.58 5.00 */ 50 **** 5.00 4.45 4.67 */ 43 **** 5.00 4.45 4.67 */ 43 **** 5.00 4.45 4.67 */ 43 **** 5.00 4.51 4.67 */ 43 **** 5.00 4.37 4.67 */ 21 **** 5.00 4.52 5.00

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
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	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4 .

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701 University of Maryland Page 706
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON Fall 2007
Enrollment: 23

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

Questionnaires: 19

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	880/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.26
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	382/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.63
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	477/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.55
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	476/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	640/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.19
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	268/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.63
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	238/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.74
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	2	0	8	6	3.94	989/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.94
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	16	4.68	575/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.68
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	699/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.84
	lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	700/1517		4.24	4.27	4.20	4.42
	the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	2	0	3	14	4.53	614/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.53
5. Did au	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				1	1	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	474/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.24
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	546/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.35
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	736/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.35
				d open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	674/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.47
		echniques succe		-	3	3	3	1	3	2	4	3.23	810/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.23
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	.		
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Electives						2	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5						

? 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901

23

COMPOSITION

BLOOM, RYAN I.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

Page 707 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions					Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	4	4	9	4	3.62	1447/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.62
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	1090/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	981/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.05
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	707/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.10
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	629/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.24
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	2	1	4	4	10	3.90	1175/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.90
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	943/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.71
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	680/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.24
		Lectur																
1 Were t	re the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	360/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.80
	d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	546/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90
	s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	726/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.40
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	9	10	4.40	769/1550		4.17	4.22		4.40
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						2	0	3	1	3		1067/1295		3.42	3.94		3.33
o. Dia au	laiovisua.	r techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	11	2	U	3	1	3	3.33	1007/1293	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.04	3.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	309/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.70
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	462/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.70
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.90
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	11	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	171/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.63
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
G., . 1		G GD3	Towns which Country				ъ.									M		
Credits E	sarned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке 	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	:1	Non-	-major	21
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3.50-4.00 3 F 0					ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0		Electives							respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I O		Otl	her					7	_					
				? 0	Other													

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001 University of Maryland Baltimore County BLOOM, RYAN I. Fall 2007

Page 708

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 1

Title

Instructor:

COMPOSITION

					Frequ NR NA 1 2							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain nev	w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	615/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.50
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	517/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.50
		estions reflec			1	8	0	0	0	3	4	4.57		4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.57
	_	ations reflect			1	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	476/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.50
			_	hat you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	633/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	4.20
6. Did wr	ritten ass:	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	416/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.47
		system clearly			1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	718/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.33
8. How ma	ny times v	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1067/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.60
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.25
		Lectur	ے															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	repared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	257/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.88	
		tor seem inter		0	0	0	0	0		15	4.94		4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.94	
			plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0		13	4.81	230/1517		4.24	4.27	4.20	4.81	
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	3		4.67		4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.67
				ur understanding	1	7	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1101/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.25
		Discus																
ו הנת ו				hat you learned	_	0	0	1	0	2	8	4 55	402/1200	4 01	4 20	4 07	3.85	4 55
				to participate	5 5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.55 4.91	403/1398 227/1391	4.01 4.10	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.55 4.91
				l co participate l open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	423/1388	4.10	4.47	4.28	4.07	
		chniques succe		open discussion	5	2	0	0	2	3	-	4.73	364/ 958		3.83	3.93		4.73
4. Were S	special ted	cilitques succe	SSIUI		5	۷	U	U	4	3	4	4.22	304/ 930	3.50	3.03	3.93	3.71	4.22
		Labora	-															
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequa	te backs	round information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
G1		C CD.		Provident of Consider				D									24	
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	В 6															
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 6		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0											_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2101 University of Maryland Page 709
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: FETTNER, PETER Fall 2007
Enrollment: 22

Ouestionnaires:	16	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	9	0	5	1	1	2 06	1636/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	2.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	2	7	0	0		1637/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	3	0	0		1394/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	6	3	1	-		1579/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	1.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	1	3	3		1465/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	2.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	5	5	3	2	0		1492/1504		4.30	4.05	3.78	2.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	4	2	4	2	1		1574/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	2.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	4	9	1	_		1627/1635		4.32	4.65	4.56	2.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	8	2	2	1			1579/1579		4.05	4.08		1.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	0	2	2	1	U	1.09	15/9/15/9	4.00	4.05	4.00	3.95	1.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	3	3	4	0	2.40	1505/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	2.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	5	2	5		1495/1520		4.71		4.61	3.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	4	1	3	2		1499/1517		4.24	4.27	4.20	2.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	4	1	3	1		1509/1550		4.17	4.22	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	3	1	1	1	0		1273/1295		3.42		3.84	
5. Fix audiovipual commiques chimanes four anacistanaing	-			_	_	-	Ü	2.00	12,3,12,3	3.30	3.12	3.71	3.01	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	3	5	0	2.92	1308/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	5	2	4	1	3.08	1310/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1095/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	917/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.50
Freq	uency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	1	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 2														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 5		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	15
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 1														
Grad. $0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0$		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
I 0		Ot1	her					4						
? 4														

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 710 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 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	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	615/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	466/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	455/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	190/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	367/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	756/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	11	7	0		1610/1635		4.32	4.65	4.56	3.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	213/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	128/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	173/1517		4.24	4.27	4.20	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	196/1550		4.17	4.22	4.17	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	943/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	234/1398		4.20	4.07	3.85	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	279/1391		4.39	4.30	4.07	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	179/1388		4.47	4.28	4.01	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	334/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.29
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	***	***	4.11	4.01	***
Seminar		_		_	_									
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82		3.65	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19 19	0	0	0	0 1	0	1		****/ 78 ****/ 80		3.70 3.97	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80		3.97	4.47 4.16	3.90	****
5. Were Criteria for grading made crear	19	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	"""/ 02		3.04	4.10	3.90	
Field Work	1.0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ FO	****	4 40	4 0 4	2 61	****
 Did field experience contribute to what you learned Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 	19 19	0	1 0	0	0 1	0	0		****/ 52 ****/ 53			4.04	3.61 3.51	****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
Frequ	ona	Diat	- rib	1+10	n									
rredi	lency	DIS	LIIDU	1010	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 2 A 8		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 9 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	neral	ı				0	Under-g	rad 3	20	Non-	major	20
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0		001	c. u	-				~	011461 -9			14011		20
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - respons				_	h
		O+1	ner					8	respons	es lo I	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
? 0	P 0 I 0 Other													

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2201

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 20 FEB 13, 2008

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2501 University of Maryland Page 711
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	23				
Questionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

						Fre	equer	ncie	5		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. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	4	2	9	6	3.81	1326/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.81
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	774/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.33
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	19	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	402/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.57
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	6	6	3.81	989/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.81
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	506/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.38
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	2	4	4	10	3.95	1109/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.95
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	5	16	0	3.76	1588/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.76
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	569/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	561/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.70	
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	674/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.45	
4. Did th	ne lecture	you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	638/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.50		
5. Did au	udiovisual	our understanding	2	1	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	413/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.32		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	752/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.05
				d to participate	3	0	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	936/1391		4.39	4.30	4.07	4.11
				d open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	471/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.68
		echniques succe		-	3	4	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	508/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.93
				Frequ	ency	, Dis	trib	ıtior	า									
				11040	circy	DID	CI ID	20101	-									
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 2 A 12							ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 2	:: :1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	0
28-55										J								
56-83	6-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 2						nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	major	22
84-150	4-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0												J				-	
Grad.							ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt			
		I O		Ot1	her					1	_		_					
			? 0															

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101 University of Maryland Page 712
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 26

FIII OTTIMETIC.	20			
Questionnaires:	23	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

								_	ncies		_		tructor		_		Level	
		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	2	2	5	9	5	3.57	1471/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.57
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	4	6	9	4	3.57	1458/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.57
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	6	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1264/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.53
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	3	5	5	8	3.86	1192/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.86
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	8	7	6	3.65	1144/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.65
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	6	9	3.78	1026/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.78
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	3	5	6	3	6	3.17	1494/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.17
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	1067/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.61
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	1	3	9	7	2	3.27	1412/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	prepared	2	0	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	1364/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.76	
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	n the subject	2	0	0	2	6	4		3.95	1429/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	3.95	
3. Was le	cture mat	xplained clearly	3		1		4			3.60	1310/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.60		
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	2		4	7	5	3.48	1340/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.48
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	9	3	5	0	3	0	2.27	1264/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.27
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	3	4	3	4	3	3.00	1271/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.00
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6		-		3	4	3	2.88	1349/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	2.88
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	2	2		4	6	3.59	1162/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.59
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	6	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	887/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.82
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$	
00-27									or Ma			1	Graduat		0	Majo		0
	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 12							cu I	J⊥ 1*10	בטנ ג	υ I		Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	/±	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 2		061	с.а.	-				_	onaci -g.	Luu Z		14011		23
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0							ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ıh
22 44.	Ü	3.30 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her					8	1 COP OND					
				± 0		001						-						

1

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 713 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 6 9 4.00 1138/1639 3.83 4.05 4.27 4.08 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 2 4 15 4.50 517/1639 3.92 4.09 4.22 4.17 4.50 0 1 3 18 4.77 261/1397 3.93 4.25 4.28 4.18 4.77 2 0 7 12 4.38 625/1583 4.00 4.22 4.19 4.01 4.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 01 9 11 4.36 478/1532 3.97 4.02 4.01 3.88 4.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 6 14 4.55 336/1504 4.03 4.30 4.05 3.78 4.55 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 6 4 12 4.27 790/1612 3.58 3.88 4.16 4.10 4.27 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 11 10 4.41 1235/1635 4.00 4.32 4.65 4.56 4.41 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 3 6 6 4.20 725/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 4.39 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 Ω Ω Ω 5 16 4.76 435/1518 4.15 4.30 4.43 4.38 4.82 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 5 16 4.76 872/1520 4.66 4.71 4.70 4.61 4.69 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 7 14 4.67 405/1517 4.17 4.24 4.27 4.20 4.77 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 5 15 4.62 511/1550 4.01 4.17 4.22 4.17 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 2 2 2 4 8 3.78 825/1295 2.89 3.42 3.94 3.84 3.78 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 4 6 3.73 980/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.85 3.73 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 1 7 3.80 1124/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.80 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 2 2 3 3 5 3.47 1201/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 3.47 4. Were special techniques successful 7 1 2 5 2 3.14 827/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 3.14 Laboratory 0 1 3.33 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 Ω 2 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** 19 0 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.25 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1 4.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 1 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 Ω 1 4.00 ****/ 78 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 20 0 0 1 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 3.50 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 0 1 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 1 3.50 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 20 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 37 **** 3.80 4.58 5.00 **** 0 1 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 0 2.50 ****/ 32 **** 4.00 4.56 4.60 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 1 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 5.00 4.45 4.54 **** 20 0 0 1 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 5.00 4.51 4.67 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 1 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 20 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 43 *** 5.00 4.69 4.69 *** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 20 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 32 *** 5.00 4.37 4.67 *** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 20 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 21 *** 5.00 4.52 5.00 **** Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Fall 2007

Page 713

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION

KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 714

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 22 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
General	0	0	0	0	_	_	0	4 00	1120/1620	2 02	4 05	4 07	4 00	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	6	9		1138/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	517/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	261/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2 1	0 1	7 9	12	4.38	625/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	-	11		478/1532			4.01	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	6 4	14 12	4.55 4.27	336/1504 790/1612		4.30	4.05 4.16	3.78 4.10	4.55 4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	10		1235/1635		4.32	4.16	4.10	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	0	3	4		312/1579		4.32	4.03	3.95	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	U	U	U	U	3	4	4.57	312/15/9	3.55	4.05	4.00	3.95	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1087/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	556/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	980/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	1	3	7							3.73
	7	0	2	2	3	3	5		1124/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	1	2	3	2	5			1201/1388 827/ 958		4.47 3.83	4.28	4.01	3.47 3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	,	1	۷	3	۷	5	۷	3.14	02// 950	3.57	3.03	3.93	3.71	3.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar	0.0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	**** O E	****	4 07	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	-	0	1 1	0	_		****/ 85 ****/ 82	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20		0			0	1	4.00	, -	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21 20	0	0	0	1 1	0	0 1	3.00	****/ 80 ****/ 82	****	3.97 3.64	4.47 4.16	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	U	U	U	1	U	Т	4.00	/ 62		3.04	4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	***	4.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
	-	-	-	-			-							

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 University of Maryland Page 714 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 715
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301

22

COMPOSITION

BLOOM, RYAN I.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

					Frequencies						tructor	_				Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo							1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1326/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.80
		ctor make clear			0	0 0	0	1	3	3	3		1326/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	3.80
		uestions reflec			0	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1324/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.67
				what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	774/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.00
	_	_		o what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22			4.30	4.05	3.78	4.22
		g system clearl		-	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1190/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.89
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1257/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.38
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	806/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.13
	_																	
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	602/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1007/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1171/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	5	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1265/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.25
		Diamo																
Discussion					3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4 57	386/1398	2 (5	4 20	4 07	2 05	4 57
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	279/1391		4.20	4.07	3.85	4.57 4.86
					3	0	0	0	0	1 1	6 6	4.86	279/1391			4.30	4.07	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful				3	0	0	0	1	1 3	3		276/1388 334/ 958		4.47			4.86	
4. were s	special t	ecuniques succe	SSIUI		3	U	U	U	Т	3	3	4.29	334/ 958	3.5/	3.83	3.93	3./1	4.29
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe		Majors		3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 0	A 2						iors		 7	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		r.ec	darr.	=u I	⊃⊥ I ^ν Ic	JOES		1	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Co	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 1		GEI	иста.	_				U	onder-9	iuu 1	. 0	INOII-	iia jui	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E14	ectiv	ves.				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Ji aa.	0	3.30 1.00	J	P 0		11.17	CCLI	v CD				•	respons				_)++
				I O		O+1	her					1	T CBPOIIB		,c 5191.	LLLCai		
				? 1		001						_						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401

23

COMPOSITION

KILLGALLON, DON

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Page 716 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			3		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	7	7	2 67	1416/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	9		1014/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	705/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	11	4.35	669/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	7	4	3		1410/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	11	4.05	802/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	469/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	8	4		1155/1579		4.05	4.08		3.78
Lecture	0	0	0	_	4	_	1.0	4 10	1006/1510	4 1 5	4 20	4 42	4 20	4 10
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	5	10		1206/1518		4.30	4.43	4.38	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	872/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1 1	0	3	5 5	12	4.29	854/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0		1	-	4 5		11	4.19	944/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	Τ	1	5	6	7	3.85	768/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	7	2	3.64	1045/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	903/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	925/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	682/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.10	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	17	O	O	Ü	_	O	_	1.00	, 150			1.10	1.25	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced	1.0	0	•	0	0	-	1	4 50		di di di 1	F 0.0	4 45	4 5 4	de de de de
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		, -	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 716 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501 University of Maryland Page 717 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	26		
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	e

							Frequencies				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 Did voi	u dain ne		_	this course	0	0	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	964/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.18
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						1	1	5	5	10		1090/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0 16	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	722/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.33
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	981/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	4.05
			_	hat you learned	1	0	2	1	5	5	8		1035/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76
	_	_		what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20			4.30	4.05	3.78	4.20
		system clearly		-	1	0	1	0	5	4	11		934/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	4.14
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	2	16	3	4.05	1479/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.05
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	8	6		1056/1579		4.05	4.08	3.95	3.90
	-	•		J														
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared	13	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	451/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	796/1550		4.17	4.22	4.17	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					14	3	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	****
Discussion																		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					16	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	329/1398		4.20	4.07	3.85	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					16	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	489/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.67
		_		l open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388		4.47	4.28	4.01	5.00 ***
4. Were special techniques successful				16	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	****	
						- D.:												
				Frequ	iency	DIS	LTID	ILIOI	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	
														- 				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	в 9														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 8		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									responses to be significa				ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	1						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Instructor:

Baltimore County FETTNER, PETER Fall 2007

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 718

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Comparison NN NN 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
1. Did you gain mew 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 and the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 7. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 8. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assigned to participate 9. Did written assigned to participate 9. Did written assigned to participate 9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did addiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assigned to participate 9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were appear the expected to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were you provided with adequate background information 6. Did the lab increase understanding of the materia
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 6 3 0 5 1 2.47 1630/1639 3.92 4.09 4.22 4.17 2.47 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 10 2 1 1 0 1 2.40 1996/1397 3.93 4.25 4.28 4.18 2.40 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 3 1 4 2 3 3 0.8 1523/1583 4.00 4.22 4.19 4.01 3.08 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 5 3 3 3.08 1523/1583 4.00 4.22 4.19 4.01 3.08 3.08 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 1 6 4 2 3.20 1358/1504 4.03 4.30 4.05 3.78 3.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 3 2 0 0 1.47 1534/1635 4.00 4.32 4.65 4.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 0 1.47 1534/1635 4.00 4.32 4.65 4.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 1.47 1534/1525 4.00 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.61 4.23 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07
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 5. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 10 3 6 4 1 1 1 0 0 1 1.75 1601/1612 3.58 3.88 4.16 4.10 1.75 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignents contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignents contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 10 3 2 0 0 1.75 1601/1612 3.58 3.88 4.16 4.10 1.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor 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. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 5. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of th
6. Didd written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 10 3 2 0 0 1.47 1634/1635 4.00 4.32 4.65 4.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 0.5.6 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 Lecture
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 6 4 1 1 0 1.75 1601/1612 3.58 3.88 4.16 4.10 1.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 10 3 2 0 0 1.47 1631/1635 4.00 4.32 4.65 4.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 4 2 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 Lecture
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 10 3 2 0 0 1.47 1634/1635 4.00 4.32 4.65 4.56 1.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 3 0 0 4 2 0 2.56 1551/1579 3.53 4.05 4.08 3.95 2.56 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 3 2 5 5 5 0 2.80 1497/1518 4.15 4.30 4.43 4.38 2.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 1 0 0 3 10 4.33 1318/1520 4.66 4.71 4.70 4.61 4.33 3. Was lecture material prepared 0 0 2 3 3 3 4 3 3.20 1433/1517 4.17 4.24 4.27 4.20 3.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 3 5 3 2 3.00 1440/1550 4.01 4.17 4.22 4.17 3.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 3 1 1 0 0 1.60 1289/1295 2.89 3.42 3.94 3.84 1.60 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 2 5 5 1 3.08 1262/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 2 3 2 5 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 3 10 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** **Laboratory** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** **Laboratory** 1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 224 **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.11 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Lecture Lect
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 lab instructor seem interested in the subject 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Discussion 8. Discussion 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 participate 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 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 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor encourage for individual attention 3. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 3. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 3. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17. Did you clea
1. Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 3 2 5 5 5 0 2.80 1497/1518 4.15 4.30 4.43 4.38 2.80 2.00 the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 1 1 0 3 10 4.33 1318/1520 4.66 4.71 4.70 4.61 4.33 2.80 2.80 2.80 2.80 2.80 2.80 2.80 2.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 3 10 4.33 1318/1520 4.66 4.71 4.70 4.61 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 3 5 3 2 3.00 1440/1550 4.01 4.17 4.24 4.27 4.20 3.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 3 5 3 2 3.00 1440/1550 4.01 4.17 4.22 4.17 3.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 3 1 1 0 0 1.60 1289/1295 2.89 3.42 3.94 3.84 1.60 Discussion Discussion Discussion 3 0 2 2 2 5 1 3.08 1262/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.85 3.08 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 3 10 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 2 3 3 3 4 3 3.20 1433/1517 4.17 4.24 4.27 4.20 3.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 3 5 3 2 3.00 1440/1550 4.01 4.17 4.22 4.17 3.00 Dia audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 3 1 1 0 0 1.60 1289/1295 2.89 3.42 3.94 3.84 1.60 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 2 2 5 1 3.08 1262/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.85 3.08 2.00 Meeting of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 2 2 3 2 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3.01 dthe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 10 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/224 **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/240 **** 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/219 **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0.3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0.3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0.3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.67 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0.3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 3 5 5 3 2 3.00 1440/1550 4.01 4.17 4.22 4.17 3.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10 3 1 1 0 0 1.60 1289/1295 2.89 3.42 3.94 3.84 1.60 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 2 5 1 3.08 1262/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.85 3.08 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 2 3 2 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.1
Discussion
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 2 5 5 1 3.08 1262/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.85 3.08 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4.00 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 8.00 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.29 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 8.00 4 2 6 4.10 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4.01 4.17 4 2 8 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 2 2 5 1 3.08 1262/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.85 3.08 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 3 10 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.43 4.44 **** 4. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 2 2 5 1 3.08 1262/1398 3.65 4.20 4.07 3.85 3.08 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 3 10 2 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.43 4.44 **** 4. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 0 0 1 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 3 2 5 3.83 1106/1391 3.89 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.83 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 3 10 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 3. 10 2 0 0 0 4 2 6 4.17 887/1388 4.22 4.47 4.28 4.01 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 3. 10 2 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** 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 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor variable 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 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. O 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. O 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. O 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** Seminar 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. O 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14. O 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14. O 0 0 0 1 0 0 0.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.05 3.51 **** 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14. O 0 0 0 1 0 0 0.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 3.57 3.83 3.93 3.71 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.67 4.47 4.25 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 ****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.48 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 82 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 80 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.27 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 3.65 4.52 4.12 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 78 **** 3.70 4.47 4.25 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 3.97 4.47 4.39 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 82 **** 3.64 4.16 3.90 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 37 **** 3.80 4.58 5.00 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.00 4.56 4.60 ****
Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 50 **** 5.00 4.45 4.54 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 43 **** 5.00 4.69 4.69 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 5.00 4.37 4.67 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 14 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.52 5.00 ****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: FETTNER, PETER

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 718 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701 University of Maryland COMPOSITION

Title Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

Page 719 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire
-------------	----------------	---------------

Questions		NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie: 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	8	6	3.86	1289/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	6	3.95	1176/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1332/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	781/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	1035/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	8	4.10	775/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	2	13		1044/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	12		1087/1635		4.32	4.65	4.56	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1148/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	968/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	1101/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	1030/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	1215/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	4	7	7	3.85	768/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	5	6	3.67	1030/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	6	3	3	5	3.28	1278/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	821/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	712/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.53
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19 19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 719 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	arned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	А	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801 University of Maryland Page 720 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: FETTNER, PETER (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		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	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1138/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	970/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	973/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	0	3	0	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	293/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	0	3	6	3.83	990/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	1548/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	3.57	1600/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	1	2	4	2	3.08	1465/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	2.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1341/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	890/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	886/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	972/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1237/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.60
Discussion														
	3	0	2	0	_	2	2	2 10	1229/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.18
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	5 1	3	∠ 5		1118/1398	3.89	4.20	4.07	4.07	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	533/1388		4.39	4.28	4.07	3.64 4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	Τ.	1	7	1	4.00	456/ 958		3.83	3.93	3.71	4.00
4. Were special techniques successiul	3	/	U	U	1	۷	1	4.00	450/ 950	3.57	3.03	3.93	3./1	4.00

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801 University of Maryland Page 721
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Title COMPOSITION Baltimore Count Instructor: FETTNER, PETER (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	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
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1138/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	970/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.14
		uestions reflect			0	8	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	973/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.00
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	3	0	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	293/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.57
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	.bute t	o what you learned	1	1	2	1	0	3	6	3.83	990/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.83
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	0	3	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	1548/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.91
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	6	8	0	3.57	1600/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.57
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1574/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	2.54
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1419/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.67
2. Did th	ne instru	n the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88		
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.13
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.08
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	10	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.60
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	1229/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.18
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	3	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1118/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.82
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	533/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.64
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	sful		3	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	}		
00 07	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3											4						
	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4					кес	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ı Jors	5	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo)r.	0
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 2					Cos	nera	1				0	IIndon a	wad 1	.4	Non	modes	1.4
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0						nera	Т				U	Under-g	rau I	.4	NON-	-major	14
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	0	D 0 F 0		רים.	ecti [.]	a				1	#### - 1	Moana +	horo a	vo not	ono	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	- 0		ъlе	=CLI	ves				Τ.	respons				_	111
P 0													respons	es co L	e sigi	ıııcaı	IL	

Other

3

I

?

0

1

Course-Section: ENGL 100H 0101 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 8

Page 722 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 8

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

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	992/1639	4.13	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.88	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1447/1612	3.38	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1350/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1579	4.88	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1318/1520	4.33	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.00

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100P 0101 University of Maryland Page 723
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 15

		Question	

Questionnaires: 13

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	QuestionsGeneral				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Cenera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1003/1639	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.15
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	583/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	4.46
		uestions reflec			2	8	0	0	1	0	2		****/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54				4.19	4.01	4.54
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	216/1532	4.69	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.69
	-	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1504	4.85	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.85
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1311/1635	4.31	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.31
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	8	1	3.80	1133/1579	3.80	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.80
		Lectur	0															
1 Were t	he instr	nrenared	Λ	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	561/1518	4.69	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.69		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520		4.71	4.70	4.61	4.92
				explained clearly	0	0 0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1517		4.24	4.27	4.20	4.46
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	690/1550		4.17	4.22	4.17	4.46
				our understanding	0	8	1	2	1	0	1		1237/1295			3.94	3.84	
3. 21a aa	.010 / 10 00.	1 000111114400 011		our unacrodularing	Ü	Ü	_	_	_	Ü	_	2.00	1237, 1273	2.00	3.12	3.71	3.01	2.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	329/1398		4.20	4.07	3.85	4.67
		-	_	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1391		4.39	4.30	4.07	4.75
		_		nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	296/1388		4.47	4.28	4.01	4.83
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	234/ 958	4.45	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.45
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ation	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Per	acone	,			Ту	ne			Majors	•
		les Reasons									, 							
00-27							quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	L3	Non-	major	13
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0					- Means there are not enough			Jh						
Р 0											responses to be significant							

Other

13

I

?

0

2

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Title

COMPOSITION Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19 Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 724 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 4 0 2.27 1633/1639 3.12 4.05 4.27 4.08 2.27 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 3 2 0 2.55 1626/1639 3.23 4.09 4.22 4.17 2.55 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1397 4.33 4.25 4.28 4.18 **** 2 7 0 1 2.82 1566/1583 3.71 4.22 4.19 4.01 2.82 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 50 6 0 0 2.09 1519/1532 3.05 4.02 4.01 3.88 2.09 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 1 2 3.30 1323/1504 3.84 4.30 4.05 3.78 3.30 5 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 6 0 4 0 0 1.80 1599/1612 3.03 3.88 4.16 4.10 1.80 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1635 4.79 4.32 4.65 4.56 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 4 4 1 2 0 2.09 1571/1579 3.55 4.05 4.08 3.95 3.35 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 6 3 2 0 0 1.64 1516/1518 3.73 4.30 4.43 4.38 3.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 2 0 4 4 4.00 1414/1520 4.53 4.71 4.70 4.61 4.35 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 6 3 0 1 0 1.60 1513/1517 3.80 4.24 4.27 4.20 3.66 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 3 2 0 0 1.70 1543/1550 3.67 4.17 4.22 4.17 3.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 4 2 1 0 1 2.00 1273/1295 3.20 3.42 3.94 3.84 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 2 3 1 0 2.38 1367/1398 3.21 4.20 4.07 3.85 2.38 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 0 3 0 4 3.75 1146/1391 3.91 4.39 4.30 4.07 3.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1 0 2 1 4 3.88 1047/1388 4.01 4.47 4.28 4.01 3.88 4. Were special techniques successful 3 3 0 2 0 1 2 3.60 682/ 958 4.01 3.83 3.93 3.71 3.60 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 **** / 240 **** **** 4.11 4.01 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 1 2 3.83 77/ 85 3.83 4.27 4.58 4.50 3.83 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0 1 3 0 1 2.83 81/ 82 2.83 3.65 4.52 4.12 2.83 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 1 1 0 1 3 0 3.20 74/ 78 3.20 3.70 4.47 4.25 3.20 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 2 1 2 3.50 71/ 80 3.50 3.97 4.47 4.39 3.50 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 60/ 82 3.67 3.64 4.16 3.90 3.67 3 3.67 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.04 3.61 **** 0 0 1 Λ 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.18 4.05 3.51 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.42 4.75 4.79 **** 10 0 0 0 1 Ω 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 10 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 37 **** 3.80 4.58 5.00 **** 0 1 0 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 50 **** 5.00 4.45 4.54 10 0 0 3.00 ****/ 43 **** 5.00 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 1 0 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 10 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 5.00 4.37 4.67 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 10 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.52 5.00 ****

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101 Title

COMPOSITION

MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 724 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19

Fall 2007

Page 725 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 11 Student Cou	ırse	Evalu	atio	on Qu	esti	onna	aire							
			Fre	mier	cies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	3	2	0		1633/1639		4.05	4.27	4.08	2.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	2	0		1626/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	2.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0			****/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	0	1		1566/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	2.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	6	0	0		1519/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	2.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	2		1323/1504			4.05	3.78	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6 0	-	4 0	0	0		1599/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	1.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	6		5.00	1/1635		4.32	4.65		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	Τ	U	U	ь	Τ	3.75	1170/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.35
Lecture		_	_		_		_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	6		1118/1518		4.30	4.43	4.38	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2			1292/1520		4.71	4.70	4.61	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	0			597/1517		4.24	4.27	4.20	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2			1077/1550		4.17			3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1089/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1367/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	0	4		1146/1391		4.39	4.30	4.07	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	4		1047/1388		4.47	4.28	4.01	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	682/ 958		3.83	3.93		3.60
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	77/ 85	3.83	4.27	4.58	4.50	3.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	1	3	0	1		81/ 82		3.65	4.52	4.12	2.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	74/ 78		3.70	4.47	4.25	3.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	71/ 80		3.97		4.39	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	60/ 82		3.64		3.90	
	_	•	_	-	_	-	_		,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101

University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Title Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11

Page 725 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Page 726 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	3	2	0		1633/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	2.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	2	0		1626/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0		****/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	0	1		1566/1583		4.22	4.19	4.01	2.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	6	0	0		1519/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	2		1323/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	0	4	0	0		1599/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	1.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.79		4.65		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	691/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	242/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6		1033/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	716/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	864/1295		3.42	3.94	3.84	
5. Fin and of the state of the	_	_	ŭ	-	_	_	_	3.71	001,1230	3.20	3.12	3.71	3.01	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1367/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1146/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1047/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	682/ 958		3.83		3.71	
Laboratory			_	_	•									
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	77/ 85	3.83	4.27	4.58	4.50	3.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	81/ 82	2.83	3.65	4.52	4.12	2.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	74/ 78	3.20	3.70	4.47	4.25	3.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	71/ 80	3.50	3.97	4.47	4.39	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	60/ 82	3.67	3.64	4.16	3.90	3.67
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	1	_	0	2 00	**** / FO		4 40	4 0 4	2 61	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Questionnaires: 11

Instructor: Enrollment: 19

(Instr. C)

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 726

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0201 University of Maryland Page 727
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 20

				
Ouestionnaires:	16	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

								Fre	equer	ncies	;		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 г	nid von	asin new	insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	2	1	3	4	5	3 60	1454/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.60
	_	_	or make clear			1	0	0	2	2	7	4		1287/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.87
			estions reflec		_	1	12	0	0	1	1	1		****/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	****
		_	tions reflect		_	1	1	0	1	3	5	5		1010/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.00
					what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	5	3		1241/1532		4.02	4.01	3.88	3.50
		_	_		o what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	6		585/1504			4.05	3.78	4.29
			system clearl		-	2	0	1	2	4	5	2		1451/1612		3.88	4.16	4.10	3.36
			as class cand		IIIca	2	0	0	0	0	1	13		529/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.93
	_				hing effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	4	1		1257/1579		4.05	4.08		3.63
· · ·	10W WOUL	a you gi	due ene overu	II ccac	illing clicectveness	Ü	Ü	O	_	_	-	_	3.03	123771377	3.33	1.05	1.00	3.75	3.03
			Lectur	е															
1. V	Were the	instruc	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	1402/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.62
2. I	oid the	instruct	or seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1166/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.54
3. V	Was lect	ure mate	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1283/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.69
4. I	oid the	lectures	contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1344/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.46
5. I	oid audi	ovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	10	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	****
			Discus	sion															
1. I	Did clas	s discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1002/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.70
2. V	Vere all	student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	940/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.09
					d open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	877/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.18
4. V	Vere spe	cial tec	chniques succe	ssful		6	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.00
					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Cred	dits Ear	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors				
00-	 -27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		7	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		0
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000	-1011	- A - C	J_ 1/10	. , 🗆	~	•	Gradati	_	•	1100	-	0
56-		0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	16
	-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001	a.	_				-	011001 9			2.011		
Gra		0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	h
		-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	
					I 0		O+1	her					5		~			-	
					± 0		001						_						

? 1

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0301 University of Maryland Page 728
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

						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 yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1435/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.64
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1427/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.64
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	536/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.45
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	7	1	3.70	1104/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.70
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	594/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.27
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	982/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.09
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.91
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1133/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.73
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	1203/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.10
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	1025/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.10
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	860/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.30
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	481/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.22
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1106/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.50
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1106/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.83
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1065/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.83
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.33
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A 8		Re	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajors	5	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		a		,				0	77 3		1	37		11
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0 F 0		m1	ecti					0	инии -	\f	h			-la
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	U	P 0		ET.	ect1	ves				U	#### - : respons				_	ìtt
				Р 0 Т 0		0+1	la					1	respons	es lo I	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				Ι 0		Ut.	her					1						

? 0

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0301 University of Maryland Page 729 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1435/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1427/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	536/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	7	1	3.70	1104/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	594/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	982/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1232/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.73
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1106/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1106/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1065/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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	n
				P	0			responses to 1	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0401 University of Maryland Page 730
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 12

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Fivaluation	Ouestionnaire	

					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 n	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	990/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	2	5		1306/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.83
		uestions reflec		-	0	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	973/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.00
	_	uations reflect		-	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	392/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.58
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	655/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.17
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	701/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.17
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	814/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.25
	_	was class cand			0	0	0	0	3	9	Ô		1589/1635		4.32	4.65	4.56	3.75
	-			ching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	0	3	4		1208/1579		4.05	4.08	3.95	3.70
3. 110 H HO	ara you	grade one overa		ming cricocryonoss	_	Ū	_	_	ŭ		-	3.70	1200, 10.3	3.33	1.05	1.00	3.75	3.70
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture		1 1	2	0	0	2	1	3	4		1318/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.90
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.70
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	0	6	4.00	1083/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1029/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.10
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	5	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1213/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.80
		Discus																
ו הנת ו					1	0	0	0	1	1	_	1 (2	355/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.63
				what you learneded to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	6 6	4.63	719/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.03
		-	_	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	546/1388	4.01	4.39	4.28	4.07	4.63
		echniques succe		d open discussion	4	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	179/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.60
4. Were b	peciai c	eciniiques succe	BBLUI		7	J	U	U		U	-	1.00	119/ 930	4.01	3.03	3.93	3.71	1.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades									Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors		3	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		-		_				_	_	_	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		_						_			_			_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					8						

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: SIMS, DIANA

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 731

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	-1	0	1	_	1	4	1.0	4 20	700/1620	1 10	4 05	4 07	4 00	4 20
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Τ	0	1	0	Ţ	4	10	4.38	780/1639	4.16	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	۷	2	12	4.41	667/1639	4.35	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	661/1397	4.16	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	929/1583	4.28	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	677/1532	3.95	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	2	11	4.19	678/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.19
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	546/1612	4.35	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	4	4.13	1441/1635	4.36	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.44	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	Λ	1	2	2	۵	1 22	1021/1518	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	837/1520	4.74	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.79
- The state of the		0	0	0	2	J	9		,					
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	•	0	•	۷	2	_	4.54	560/1517	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	787/1550	4.44	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	545/1295	3.80	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	742/1398	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	1	2	6	3 83	1106/1391	4.02	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	1	7		1025/1388	4.26	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	n	1	1	1	,	4.45	234/ 958	4.48	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.45
i. Were special techniques successful	5	_	U	1			0	4.45	234/ 930	7.40	3.03	3.33	3.71	1.43
Freq	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades			d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0201

COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Title Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T

Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 732 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionna	aire
--------------------------------------	------

Questions	NR	NA 	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	5	0	10	3.94	1206/1639	4.16	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	822/1639	4.35	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1063/1397	4.16	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	560/1583	4.28	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	2	7		1035/1532	3.95	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	797/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	837/1612	4.35	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	0			1080/1635	4.36	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	702/1579	4.44	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	807/1518	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	13		1006/1520	4.74	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	875/1517	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	638/1550	4.44	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1000/1295	3.80	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	770/1398	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1391	4.02	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	571/1388	4.26	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.48	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1 0	0	0		****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	***

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0201

Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Instructor:

COLLINS, ELSA T

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 732 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6 6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0201

INTRODUCTION TO LIT

Title

Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 733 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			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	2	0	1	0	3	11	14	4.28	870/1639	4.28	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	7	8	11		1268/1639	3.90	4.09	4.22	4.27	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	1	6	19	4.41	646/1397		4.25	4.28	4.39	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	6	11	11	4.18	871/1583		4.22	4.19	4.28	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	229/1532	4.68	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	8	7		4.18	- ,		4.30	4.05	4.09	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	5	8			1044/1612		3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	8	19	1		1589/1635		4.32	4.65	4.63	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	7	11	5		1039/1579			4.08	4.14	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	4	7	13	4.24	1110/1518	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	597/1520	4.88	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	10	14	4.42	700/1517	4.42	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	7	17	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1140/1295	3.13	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	351/1388	4.79	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	17	10	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 958	***	3.83	3.93	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	***	****	4.11	4.47	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	***	3.70	4.47	****	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	***	4.18	4.05	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	***	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	ı									

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	31	Non-major	30	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	16	_				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101

Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE

Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 21

DA R Fall

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 734 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions				NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies	s 4	5		tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		1															
1 Did vo	u gain ng	General w insights,skills	from this source	0	0	0	3	3	9	6	2 06	1289/1639	3.86	4.05	4.27	4.35	3.86
_	_	ctor make clear th		0	0	0	1	4	8	8		1021/1639		4.09	4.27	4.27	4.10
		lestions reflect t		0	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	850/1397		4.25	4.28	4.39	4.19
	_	ations reflect th		0	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	900/1583		4.22	4.19	4.28	4.14
			to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	7	8	4.11			4.02	4.01	4.09	4.11
	_	3	te to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	8	6		1042/1504		4.30	4.05	4.09	3.76
		g system clearly e	_	0	0	0	1	4	6			882/1612		3.88	4.16	4.21	4.19
		was class cancell		0	0	0	0	4	13	4		1497/1635		4.32	4.65	4.63	4.00
			teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	5	7			1232/1579		4.05		4.14	
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	905/1518	4.44	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.44
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interest	ed in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	925/1520	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.73
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented a	nd explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.40
		es contribute to w		6	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1000/1550	4.13	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.13
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enhan	ce your understanding	6	7	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1143/1295	3.13	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.13
		Discussio	n														
			to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	-,		4.20	4.07	4.14	4.11
		_	raged to participate	12 12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391		4.39	4.30	4.35	4.89
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	609/1388		4.47	4.28	4.37	4.56
4. Were sp	Were special techniques successful			12	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	3.83	3.93	4.00	4.33
		Laborator	-														
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequate	background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
1 1/2		Seminar	the surround thems	1.0	1	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 85	++++	4 07	4 50	4 00	****
			the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0 1	T	5.00	****/ 85 ****/ 80		4.27	4.58	4.00	****
		ons contribute to		19 19	1 1	0	0	0	U T	1		****/ 82		3.97 3.64	4.47 4.16	2.00	****
5. were c	riteria i	for grading made c	rear	19	Τ.	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 82		3.04	4.10	4.00	
1 5 1 6 1		Field Wor		0.0	0	-	•	0	•	0	1 00	***** 50	de de de de	4 40	4 0 4	4 50	de de de de
	_		to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52		4.48	4.04		****
2. Did you	u clearly	y understand your	evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.28	****
1 Did ac	lf magad	Self Pac		20	0	1	0	0	0	٥	1 00	****/ 50	****	E 00	1 1E	3.24	****
i. Dia se.	II-paceu	system contribute	to what you learned	20	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 50		5.00	4.45	3.24	
	Fre				Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade				Reasons						Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	3	 Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55																	
56-83					Gei	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	18
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0				- 7						0	шш и и	M	- la			-la
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_][]
					∩+1	her				1	responses to be significant						
	I 0				ULI	rict				1	· U						

Course-Section: ENGL 233 0101 University of Maryland Title ISSUES IN WORLD LIT

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 735

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 26 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Overtions							Fre	equen	cie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
		Genera																
		w insights,ski			0	0	2	0	4	11	9		1183/1639		4.05	4.27	4.35	3.96
		tor make clear			0	0	1	2	4	12	7		1300/1639		4.09	4.22	4.27	3.85
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	5	9	12	4.27	785/1397		4.25	4.28	4.39	4.27
		ations reflect			0	4	1	2	6	6	7		1282/1583		4.22	4.19	4.28	3.73
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5		4.72	203/1532		4.02	4.01	4.09	4.72
		_		what you learned	1	6	0	0	4	7		4.21	. ,		4.30	4.05	4.09	4.21
		system clearl		ined	1	0	0	5	6	6			1316/1612		3.88	4.16	4.21	3.68
		was class canc			1	1	0	0	0	-			1045/1635		4.32	4.65	4.63	4.63
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	13	4	3.95	972/1579	3.95	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.95
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	_	orepared	6	0	0	1	2	6	11	4 35	1000/1518	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.35
		tor seem inter			5	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	872/1520		4.71	4.70	4.78	4.76
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	-		4.38	747/1517		4.24	4.27	4.34	4.38
		s contribute t			5	0	0	1	2	7			832/1550		4.17	4.22	4.33	4.33
				our understanding	7	9	4	0	3	0			1213/1295				4.07	
J. Dia ac	aiovibaai	ccciniiques cii	nance y	our understanding	,		-	O	3	O	,	2.00	1213/12/3	2.00	3.12	3.71	1.07	2.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	342/1398	4.64	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.64
2. Were a	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				12	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	678/1391	4.43	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.43
3. Did th	ne instruc	tor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	721/1388	4.43	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.43
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	ssful		13	7	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.00	****
1 511.1		Labora	-	5 . 1	0.5	0	•	0	-	0	0	2 00		ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 10	4 22	ale ale ale ale
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	nding of	t the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssianed t			announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.00	****
				ividual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82		3.65	4.52	3.00	****
				what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78		3.70	4.47	****	****
		or grading mad		mas you rearned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82		3.64	4.16	4.00	****
		35											,					
	Fre					Dist	crib	ution	1									
G 3	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							ъ.,		_							Na	
crealts E	credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad					Reasons				pe 			Majors					
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55																		
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	1				8	Under-g	rad 2	6	Non-	major	25
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 6 D 0																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_								_						

Other

I 0

1

Course-Section: ENGL 241A 0101 University of Maryland MODERN BRITISH NOVEL Baltimore County

Title Fall 2007 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 14

- ·	 	
	Evaluation	

Page 736

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	1466/1639	3.57	4.05	4.27	4.35	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	1036/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	897/1397	4.14	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	832/1583	4.21	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 0	1	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	629/1504	4.23	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	996/1612	4.07	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1056/1579	3.90	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	670/1518		4.30	4.43	4.48	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520		4.71	4.70	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	747/1517	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	860/1550	4.31	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	745/1398	4.08	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	2	3	1	5		1252/1391	3.38	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	802/1388		4.47	4.28	4.37	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	4	1	4	0	1	2.30	933/ 958		3.83	3.93	4.00	2.30
Fred	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	า									
•														
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	4	_				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ENGL 241B 0101 University of Maryland Title BEAUTY PLEASURE DEC IM Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 737

			Fre	equer	ncie	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	2	3	11	4.56	550/1639	4.56	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1044/1639	4.06	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1397	4.40	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	603/1504	4.27	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	11	1	3.75	1589/1635	3.75	4.32	4.65	4.63	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	0	5	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	5		725/1520		4.71	4.70	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	1	3		1083/1517	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	3		832/1550		4.17	4.22	4.33	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.00	****
Eream		. Dia	- m i bı	.+ :	-									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 243A 0101

48

WRITERS LOOK AT WAR

BENSON, LINDA K

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 31

Fall 2007

Page 738

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	12	12	4.10	1075/1639	4.10	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	19	9	4.16	948/1639	4.16	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	12	14	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	14	12	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	197/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	13	15	4.43	453/1504	4.43	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	12	12	4.17	913/1612	4.17	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	26	3	4.10	1454/1635	4.10	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	16	5	4.04	865/1579	4.04	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	957/1518	4.39	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	13	12	4.28	864/1517	4.28	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	7	7	7	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	5	12	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	579/1391	4.55	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	3	10	4	3.89	540/ 958		3.83	3.93	4.00	3.89

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101

COMIC BOOK LITERATURE

Title Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL

Enrollment: 49 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 739

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Canaval														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	8	18	4.21	939/1639	4.21	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	15	14	4.18	937/1639	4.18	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	2	4	16	4.42	646/1397	4.42	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	4	8	16	4.09	946/1583	4.09	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	158/1532	4.79	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	5	18	4.25	612/1504	4.25	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	7	3	19	4.06	1010/1612	4.06	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	13	19	1	3.59	1599/1635	3.59	4.32	4.65	4.63	3.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	506/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	28	4.84	725/1520	4.84	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	6	4		4.47	648/1517	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	1	23	4.48	664/1550	4.48	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	24	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	616/1398	4.26	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	639/1391	4.47	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	411/1388	4.74	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	17	14	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	***	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	***	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	***	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32		5.00	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101

Title COMIC BOOK LITERATURE

Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL

Enrollment: 49
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 739 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	15	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101 University of Mary:
Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE Baltimore County
Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA Fall 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 740 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	30	
Questionnaires:	23	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

0

							Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	281/1639	4.78	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.78
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	696/1639	4.39	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.39
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	5	8	9	4.09	942/1397	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.09
4. Did of	ther evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	371/1583	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.61
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	137/1532	4.83	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.83
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	453/1504	4.43	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.43
7. Was tl	he grading	system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	644/1612	4.39	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.39
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1342/1635	4.26	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.26
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	590/1579	4.32	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.32
		Lecture																
1 Were	the instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	Ο	20	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.48	5.00
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.78	5.00
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.80
		es contribute to		-	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	174/1550	4.90	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.90
				our understanding	3	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	383/1295		3.42	3.94		4.35
		-	-	J														
		Discus																
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	303/1398		4.20	4.07	4.14	4.71
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	380/1391	4.76	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.76
				nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	244/1388		4.47	4.28	4.37	4.88
4. Were	special te	chniques succes	ssful		7	3	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	794/ 958	3.31	3.83	3.93	4.00	3.31
		Semina	_															
1. Were a	assigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	4.27	4.58	4.00	***
				Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıtior	1									
				11040	CIICI	DID		20101	-									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Rec	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10						J						5 -		-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 1									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons				_	
				T 0		0+1					- 1	2	-		_			

Other

13

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101 University of Maryland Page 741 Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor		Dept		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	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	508/1639	4.61	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.61
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	220/1639	4.78	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.78
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	10	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	408/1397	4.62	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.62
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.67
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	111/1504	4.91	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.91
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	561/1612	4.45	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.45
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	122/1579	4.86	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.86
		Lecture		_														
					3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	286/1518		4.30	4.43	4.48	4.85
	the instructor's lectures well prepared ne instructor seem interested in the subject secture material presented and explained clea			_	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.95
					3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.80
		es contribute t		-	3	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	351/1550		4.17	4.22		4.75
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	11	1	0	Τ	4	2	3.75	838/1295	3.75	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.75
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al:	ace dieci			what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.75
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	300/1391	4.83	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.83
		_	_	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.67
		chniques succe		a open arbeabbion	11	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	629/ 958		3.83	3.93	4.00	3.73
1	poorar oc	Joining and Dagoo.	55242			_	_	ŭ		-		3.73	023, 330	3.73	3.05	3.75	1.00	3.73
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	l				7	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					7						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101 University of Maryland Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 742

				Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NI	R	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	١ .	0	0	Λ	Λ	1	1	12	4.79	281/1639	4.79	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	295/1639	4.71	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	299/1583	4.69	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you lear		0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.36	488/1532		4.02	4.01	4.09	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you le		0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	163/1504	4.79	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	arnea (-	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	934/1612		3.88	4.16	4.21	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	5	9		1023/1635	4.64	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective		2.	0	0	0	1	7	4		657/1579		4.05	4.08	4.14	4.25
y. non would you grade one overdir codoning cricoon.	circus .	_	Ü	Ū	Ū	-	•	-	1.25	037, 1373	1.25	1.00	1.00		1123
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	-	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	770/1518	4.54	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	:	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clea	rly :	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	287/1517	4.77	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	-	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	338/1550	4.77	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan	nding :	1	8	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	346/1295	4.40	3.42	3.94	4.07	4.40
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you lear	ned 4	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1398	4.90	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to particip	ate 4	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus	sion 4	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.83	3.93	4.00	4.67
	Frequenc	су	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G	rades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	1						

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

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 743

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	g.		MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies	5	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion	5 									Mean		Mean	Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	318/1639	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.75
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	517/1639	4.44	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.50
3. Did	the exam o	questions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	795/1397	4.38	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.25
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	323/1583	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.67
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	714/1532	3.78	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.08
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	306/1504	4.66	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.58
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	1044/1612	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	1462/1635	4.41	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.08
9. How	would you	grade the overa	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	601/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.30	
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	e the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1021/1518	4.46	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.33
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	2	7		855/1520		4.71	4.70	4.78	4.78
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1016/1517		4.24	4.27	4.34	4.11
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	0	5	4		716/1550		4.17	4.22	4.33	4.44
				our understanding	4	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1295	3.40	3.42	3.94	4.07	****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did	alaga diga			what you learned	-	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	721/1398	4.62	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.13
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	258/1391		4.39	4.30	4.35	4.88
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388		4.47	4.28	4.37	4.88
		echniques succe		a open arscassion	5	0	0	1	1	5	-	3.75	610/ 958		3.83	3.93	4.00	3.75
1	c special c	COLLITATION DUCCE	22242			Ü	Ü	_	_	J	_	3.73	020, 330		3.03	3.75	1.00	3.73
				Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	iors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 5						,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				-	-) -		=
56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-q	rad 1	L3	Non-	major	9
84-15		3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3		-		5 2	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6	-					
				? 0														

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

Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 19
Ouestionnaires: 16

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 744

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 5 4.06 1096/1639 4.42 4.05 4.27 4.35 4.06 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 8 5 4.13 992/1639 4.44 4.09 4.22 4.27 4.13 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 14 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1397 4.38 4.25 4.28 4.39 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 371/1583 4.61 4.22 4.19 4.28 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 3 5 3 3.27 1357/1532 3.78 4.02 4.01 4.09 3.27 0 0 5 11 4.69 230/1504 4.66 4.30 4.05 4.09 4.69 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 802/1612 4.29 3.88 4.16 4.21 4.27 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 11 4 4.27 1342/1635 4.41 4.32 4.65 4.63 4.27 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 Ω 2 3 7 4.42 933/1518 4.46 4.30 4.43 4.48 4.42 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 437/1520 4.86 4.71 4.70 4.78 4.93 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 498/1517 4.42 4.24 4.27 4.34 4.58 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 2 2 7 4.17 972/1550 4.35 4.17 4.22 4.33 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 12 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1295 3.40 3.42 3.94 4.07 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 200/1398 4.62 4.20 4.07 4.14 4.83 2 10 4.83 1/1391 4.92 4.39 4.30 4.35 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 12 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 296/1388 4.80 4.47 4.28 4.37 4.83 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 1 1 2 8 4.42 260/958 4.22 3.83 3.93 4.00 4.42 0

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301 University of Maryland Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 18

~· .			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 745

			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	Λ	0	0	0	2	6	1.0	4.44	698/1639	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	306/1639	4.44	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1397	4.38	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	413/1583	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	774/1532	3.78	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	215/1504	4.66	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	376/1612		3.88	4.16	4.21	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.41	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	342/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	Λ	6	10	4.63	656/1518	4.46	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	622/1520	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	523/1517	4.42	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	729/1550		4.17	4.22	4.33	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	1	1	0	1	2		1035/1295		3.42	3.94	4.07	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	Λ	1	9	4.90	161/1398	4.62	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.92	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	201/ 958		3.83	3.93	4.00	4.50
1. Were special econifiques successful	O	_	O	U	_		5	1.50	201/ 550	1.22	3.03	3.73	1.00	1.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ation	n									
•	-													

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				2	1						

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

Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI Fall 2007

> I 0

?

0

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 15

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

Page 746

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

				Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	582/1639	4.60	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.53
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	415/1639	4.61	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.60
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	517/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	186/1583	4.75	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.80
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	236/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.67
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	195/1504	4.67	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.73
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	546/1612	4.56	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.47
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.86	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	601/1579	4.38	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.30
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1518	4.73	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.86
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was led	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.86		
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	313/1550	4.76	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.79
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	505/1295	4.20	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1398	4.79	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.80
2. Were al	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	159/1391	4.82	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.93
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	265/1388	4.72	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.87
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succes	ssful		0	2	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	325/ 958	4.40	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.31
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 `S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 7			=			J						5 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													3 -	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - : respons				_	gh

Other

12

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201

Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 18

NE Fall

University of Maryland Page 747
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e 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	1	4	13	4.67	430/1639	4.60	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	404/1639	4.61	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	408/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	292/1583	4.75	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	165/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1		12	4.61	283/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	340/1612	4.56	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1635	4.86	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	427/1579	4.38	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	684/1518	4.73	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	323/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	376/1550	4.76	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	4.20	3.42	3.94	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	234/1398	4.79	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	441/1391	4.82	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	593/1388	4.72	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	201/ 958	4.40	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.50
Seminar							_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	-	-	0	0	0	1		****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 82		3.64	4.16	4.08	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	Ο	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****
1. 11. Someteness help jou outly out little desivities	-,	J	,	3	J	J	_	2.00	, 32		1.00	1.50	1.50	
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				2	1						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 748

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

24050101111				Doddeno oo			uu 0 1 1	J.1 Q		- 0 - 1 - 1		•						
							Fre	eque	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
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		is course	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	698/163	9 4.44	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.4
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2		4.78	231/163		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.7
		estions reflect			0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/139		4.25	4.28	4.26	***
	_	ations reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78			4.22	4.19	4.24	4.7
		adings contribu			0	0	0	0	5		11	4.33			4.02	4.01	4.05	4.3
		signments contri			0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94			4.30	4.05	4.12	4.9
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	2	8			718/161		3.88	4.16	4.12	4.3
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	9			1135/163		4.32	4.65	4.66	4.5
		grade the overal		effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6			332/157		4.05	4.08	4.07	
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures		ared	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	397/151	3 4.79	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.7
		ctor seem intere			4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/152		4.71		4.68	5.0
		erial presented			4	0	0	0	2			4.57			4.24			4.5
		es contribute to			4	0	0	0	3	4			875/155			4.22	4.20	4.2
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu		you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	172/139	3 4.89	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.8
		nts actively end			9	0	0	0	0	1		4.89			4.39	4.30	4.35	4.8
		ctor encourage f	-		9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/138	3 4.89	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.8
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		9	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	682/ 95	3.60	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.6
		Seminar	<u>-</u>															
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute t	to what you	learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 8) ****	3.97	4.47	4.65	***
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8	2 ****	3.64	4.16	4.08	***
		Field W	Vork															
		ctor available f			17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	2 ****	4.42	4.75	4.63	***
4. To wha	t degree	could you discu	ıss your ev	aluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3	7 ****	3.80	4.58	4.52	***
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out field	activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 3	2 ****	4.00	4.56	4.30	***
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	E:	xpected Grades				Rea	asons	5			T	уре			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 8		De/			or Ma			0	 Gradua		0	 Majo		 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		1/6/	darr.	cu I	OT 1410	בטנ ג	D	U	Gradua		U	Ma JC	, <u>+</u>	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-	rrad 1	.8	Non-	major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0		061	с.а.	-				5	OHACL -	J = 444 -		14011		,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		ភ្ ា	ectiv	760				1	#### _	Means t	here =	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	0	3.30 1.00	-	P 0		11.1	CCCI	v CD				_		ses to b			_	7+4
				I 0		O+1	her				1	.2	I CSPOII		o bigi	ıııcaı		
				? 1		001						-						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101 University of Maryland Page 749 Title BRIT LIT: MEDIEVAL/RENA Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 16

-				
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	ם אינ כמר

								equei		S			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. D:	id you gain	new insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.75
2. D:	id the instr	uctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	926/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19
3. D:	id the exam	questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. D:	id other eva	luations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	444/1583	4.53	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.53
5. D:	id assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	121/1532	4.87	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.87
6. D	id written a	ssignments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.60
7. Wa	as the gradi	ng system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	669/1612	4.38	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.38
	-	s was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1441/1635	4.13	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.13
9. Ho	ow would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1579	4.45	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.45
		Lectur	e.															
1. We	ere the inst	ructor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	863/1518	4.46	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.46
		uctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Wa	as lecture m	aterial presente	d and	explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. D	id the lectu	res contribute to	o what	you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.67
5. D	id audiovisu	al techniques en	nance y	your understanding	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	***
		Discus	sion															
1. D:	id class dis			what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.50
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.60
		_	_	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	7		459/1388	4.70	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.70
		techniques succe			6	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 958	***	3.83	3.93	3.97	***
				Eroc	nong	/ Dist	+ r i h	1+101	_									
	FI							ucioi	.1									
Cred	its Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons								Ty	рe			Majors	3
00-2	 27 0	0.00-0.99	0		Required for Majors					s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	10	
28-5	55 1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3	Required for Me					3 -								
56-8	3 3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	6

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

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101 University of Maryland Page 750 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

TILLE BRIT LII. VICTORIA

Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 10

56-83

84-150

Grad.

2

2

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

2

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Non-major

1

							Fr	eque:	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	391/1639	4.70	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.70
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	kpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.60
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	ct the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.80
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.80
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.02	4.01	4.05	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ribute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	222/1504	4.70	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.70
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	113/1612	4.90	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.90
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.90	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.90
9. How wo	would you grade the overall teaching effective Lecture					0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	nstructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.80
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subject	1	1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.71 4.70			4.68	5.00								
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.56
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	196/1550	4.89	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.89
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.00
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.80
2. Were a	11 stude	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.90
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.90
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	essful	_	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	111/ 958	4.78	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.78
	F					7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Gualita =								_					_				M	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades Rea						ason	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	; 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														

General

Electives

Other

1

9

Under-grad 10

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101 University of Maryland Page 751 Title FEB 13, 2008 AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR STEWART, CAROLE Fall 2007 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	29				
Questionnaires:	23	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

							Fr	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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 vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	_	m this course	0	0	0	3	2	11	7	3.96	1195/1639	3.96	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.96
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	800/1639	4.32	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.32
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	749/1397	4.30	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.30
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	1	1	12	9	4.26	781/1583	4.26	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.26
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	9	12	4.35	497/1532	4.35	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.35
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	521/1504	4.36	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.36
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	860/1612	4.22	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.22
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	968/1635	4.70	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.70
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1102/1579	3.84	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.84
		Lecture																
1 Were t	he instri	actor's lectures		prepared	2	0	1	1	Λ	7	12	4 33	1021/1518	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.33
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	7	13		1136/1520	4.57	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.57
				explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	6	Δ.		1182/1517	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.90
		es contribute to			2	0	3	1	3	3	11		1188/1550	3.86	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.86
				our understanding	_	12	1	0	2	3			953/1295		3.42	3.94		3.56
5. Did au	.uiovisuai	r techniques em	iance y	our understanding	۷	12	_	U	3	3	2	3.30	953/1295	3.30	3.42	3.94	3.93	3.30
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	887/1398		4.20	4.07	4.13	3.90
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	601/1391	4.52	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.52
		_		d open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	558/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	4.62
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		2	5	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	674/ 958	3.63	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.63
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pes	ason	c c			Туј	ne			Majors	
CICUICS E																		,
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 12														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
											_	_						

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR

Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 752

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	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 ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1044/1639	4.06	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.06
		uestions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.75
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	524/1583	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.47
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	299/1532	4.56	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.56
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	428/1612	4.56	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.56
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1114/1635	4.53	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.53
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	702/1579	4.21	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.21
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the	the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clea				0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	382/1520	4.94	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.94
3. Was le	lecture material presented and explained clea				0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	451/1517	4.63	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.63
4. Did the	he lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	796/1550	4.38	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.38
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				0	1	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	582/1398	4.31	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.31
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	380/1391	4.77	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.77
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	286/1388	4.85	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.85
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	3	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	603/ 958	3.77	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.77
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Crodita F	arnod	Cum CDA		Exposted Crades				D.O.	ason	a			Ту	20			Majors	
	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra									.s 			ту. 	 pe			Majors 	·
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	15
28-55								_						_				
56-83						Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	1
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	βh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her				1	.3						

?

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101

THEORIES OF COMM TECH

Title Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 753 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	4	7	3		1506/1639			4.27	4.28	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	4	2		1557/1639	3.20	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1397	3.75		4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	967/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	9	4		1035/1532	3.47	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	10	2		1003/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	3.81
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	1	1	3	7	3	2		1506/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	11			1366/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	6	0	3.38	1371/1579	3.39	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1428/1518	3.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	10		1087/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	6	2		1361/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	3	5		1344/1550		4.17	4.22	4.20	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	459/1295		3.42	3.94		4.25
	_	-	-	_	_	_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	715/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	489/1391	4.13	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	740/1388	3.80	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	690/ 958	3.58	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.58
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	3.70	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****		4.16	4.08	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 62		3.04	4.10	4.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43		5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
5. Hold chough proceeds for all the betweenes	Τ,	J	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 21		3.00	1.52	3.00	
_			1											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
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 significant I 0 Other 14 ? 1

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0201 University of Maryland

Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH

Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 13 Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 754 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eva.	luatio	n Que	sti	onnai	ire
---------	--------	------	--------	-------	-----	-------	-----

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Mean Mean Mean 4.05 4.27 4.28 4.09 4.22 4.20 4.25 4.28 4.26 4.22 4.19 4.24 4.02 4.01 4.05 4.30 4.05 4.12 3.88 4.16 4.12 4.32 4.65 4.66 4.05 4.08 4.07 4.30 4.43 4.39 4.71 4.70 4.68 4.24 4.27 4.23 3.42 3.94 3.95 4.20 4.07 4.13 4.39 4.30 4.35	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1484/1639	3.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1568/1639	3.20	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1175/1397	3.75	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1479/1583	3.67	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1384/1532	3.47	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	7	0	2	3.44	1240/1504	3.63	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	1	3	1	2		1558/1612	2.96	3.88		4.12	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	8		1034/1635	4.44	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	0	6	1	3.40	1364/1579	3.39	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1481/1518	3.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1479/1517	3.15	4.24	4.27	4.23	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1491/1550	2.98	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	4.25	3.42	3.94	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1222/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	2		1192/1391	4.13			4.35	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	1		1282/1388	3.80			4.34	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 958	3.58	3.83	3.93	3.97	****

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

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101 University of Maryland Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH Baltimore County Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 755
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	19					
Ouestionnaires:	14		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	371/1639	4.64	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.64
3. Did th	ie exam qi	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	250/1397	4.79	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.79
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.75
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1504	3.85	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.85
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	694/1612	4.36	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.36
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	840/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.79
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.20
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.50
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.92
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	747/1517	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.38
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	424/1550	4.69	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.69
5. Did au	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	***	3.42	3.94	3.95	****
		Discus	zion															
1 Did al	agg digcı			what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	582/1398	4 31	4.20	4.07	4 13	4.31
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	,		4.39	4.30	4.35	4.54
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	558/1388			4.28	4.34	4.62
		chniques succes		a open alboabbion	1	9	1	0	0	3	0		806/ 958		3.83	3.93		3.25
				_			,											
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	Jt10	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						guire	ed f	or Ma	ijor		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	11
28-55							1			. ,	-		- 3	-	-	5		
56-83						Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	3
84-150													5				3	
Grad.	Frad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	_j h
	P 0												respons				_	
	I O				Ot1	her				1	.2	-						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101 University of Maryla Title CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT Baltimore County Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

23

University of Maryland Page 756
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	----------

					1				Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did v	von gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	Ο	6	10	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.63
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	926/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19
		uestions reflec			0	9	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	767/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.29
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	697/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	117/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.88
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	7		,			4.05	4.12	4.31
		g system clearl			0	3	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	996/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	4.08
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1094/1635	4.56	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.56
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6			473/1579		4.05	4.08	4.07	4.43
		Lecture																
			_			_					405/4540							
		uctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	3		4.77	435/1518		4.30	4.43	4.39	4.77
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	0		13	5.00	1/1520		4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	0		10		287/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	4.77
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	_	12	4.92	139/1550		4.17		4.20	4.92
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	590/1295	4.08	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.08
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc			what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1398	4.78	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.78
				d to participate	7	-	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391		4.39	4.30	4.35	4.89
				d open discussion	7		0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	4.89
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	7	5	1	1	1	0		2.75	895/ 958		3.83	3.93	3.97	2.75
	_	-																
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А 9		Re	guir	 ed f	 or M	aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	9
28-55						100	-1011	- L	O. 1.1	۱۰۲ د	~	•	Gradat	_	-	11000	-	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1			1	0	Under-q	rad 1	L6	Non-	-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				_			_		011001 9		-	2.011		•
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ah	
	-	2.22 2.00	•	P 0	Electives							-	respons				_	,
				I O		O+1	her					7			3-		-	
				3 0		00.						•						
				. •														

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101 University of Maryland Page 757 Title FEB 13, 2008

STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE Baltimore County Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL Fall 2007

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	-					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	Λ	3	q	4.54	582/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	486/1639	4.54	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	444/1583	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	94/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	_	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	617/1612	4.42	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7		1114/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 5	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	527/1579		4.05	4.08	4.07	
		-	-	•	-	_	_		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518	4.92	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1517	4.85	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	242/1550	4.85	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	g 4	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	436/1295	4.29	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.13	4.67
·	_ 1	0			1	U T	11		,				4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 1	2	0	0	7	0		4.83	296/1388 364/ 958	4.83	4.47	4.28		4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	U	U	2	3	4	4.22	364/ 958	4.22	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.22
Fr	trib	utio	n											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	es			Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: ENGL 364 0101 University of Maryland Title PERSP ON WOMEN IN LIT Baltimore County

Page 758 FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28 Quest

tionnaires:	23	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					3 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	ou gain n	new insights,ski	-	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	342/1639	4.74	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.74
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	273/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.74
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	189/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.86
	-	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	207/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.78
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	94/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.91
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	19		163/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	4.78
		ng system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	2	20		155/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	4.83
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	11	12		1121/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	4.52
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0				332/1579		4.05	4.08	4.07	4.55
		Lectur																
			_								4 /4 = 4 0							
		ructor's lecture			1	-	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1518		4.30	4.43	4.39	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1520		4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0			4.95	79/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	4.95
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	0			4.95	87/1550		4.17		4.20	4.95
5. Did a	udiovisua	il techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	18	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	172/1398	4.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.88
2. Were a	all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	136/1391	4.94	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.94
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	6	1	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	386/ 958	4.19	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.19
				Frequ	ency	r Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11						quire	ed fo	or Ma	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	14
28-55							_			3 -								
56-83						Gei	nera:	L			1	.4	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	9
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	3.00-3.49 2 D 0								_		5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
				P 0	Hiccorves								respons				_	
	I 0					Otl	her					9	-		5			
				? 2														

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101 University of Maryland Page 759 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GOODMAN, IVY

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA		_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
			- 															
		Genera	1															
		new insights,ski			0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.25
		uctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	5	4		1029/1639	4.08	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.08
		questions reflec		_	0		0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****
		luations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	181/1583			4.19	4.24	
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4		774/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10		138/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	4.83
		ng system clearl		ined	0	2	0	0	5	2	3		1253/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	3.80
		s was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	12		1/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. Hov	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.75
			Lecture tor's lectures well prepared															
					1	0	2	0	0	5			1347/1518			4.43	4.39	3.82
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	0	10		776/1520		4.71	4.70	4.68	4.82
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	1	0	7			1030/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	4.09
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	2	0	1	4			1250/1550		4.17	4.22	4.20	3.73
5. Dio	d audiovisu	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	****
1		Discus			-	0	•	0	•	_	•	4 00	011/1200	4 00	4 00	4 05	4 10	4 00
				what you learned	1	-	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	211/1398			4.07	4.13	4.82
				d to participate	1		0	0	1	0	10	4.82	321/1391	4.82	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.82
		_		d open discussion	1	0 7	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	423/1388		4.47	4.28		4.73
4. wei	re special	techniques succe	ssiui		1	/	U	0	2	1	Τ	3.75	610/ 958	3.75	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.75
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	atio	n									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	:
										- -								
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	5 0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83		2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	6
84-15		3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad	. 0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0					0	#### - 1				_	jh		
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101 University of Maryland CREATIVE WRITING-POETR Baltimore County

Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 6

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

Page 760

	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	Ο	1	Ο	0	5	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	3		1136/1532	3.67	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1122/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	511/1398	4.40	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	3.97	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rih	ıtioı	า									
ricqu	ciicy	ייייי		10101										

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	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 375 0101 University of Maryland Page 761 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Title MASTERWORKS FOR WRITER Baltimore County Fall 2007 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

		Ouestionnair	

								Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1. D:	id vou ga	in new :	0 0	_	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	572/1639	4.55	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.55
			r make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	476/1639	4.55	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.55
					spected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50
		_	ions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.36
				_	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	478/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.36
	_		_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	429/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	4.45
7. Wa	as the gr	ading s	ystem clearl	y explai	ined	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00
			s class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	796/1635	4.82	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.82
					ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.60
1 W.	ere the i	net ruet (Lecture or's lecture		repared	Λ	0	0	0	0	А	7	4.64	643/1518	4 64	4.30	1 13	4.39	4.64
				_	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	943/1520	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.73
					plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	547/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	4.55
			contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	703/1550	4.45	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.45
				-	our understanding	0	7	1	1	1	1	0		1247/1295		3.42		3.95	
J. D.	id addiov	isuai c	eciniiques en	nance yo	our understanding	U	,	_				U	2.50	124//1293	2.50	3.42	3.91	3.93	2.50
			Discus	sion															
1. D	id class	discuss	ions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	682/1398	4.18	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.18
2. We	ere all s	tudents	actively en	couraged	d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	516/1391	4.64	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.64
3. D:	id the in	structo	r encourage	fair and	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.64
4. We	ere speci	al techi	niques succe	ssful		0	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	544/ 958	3.88	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.88
							- D-1												
					Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	at 101	n									
Cred	its Earne	i	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	•
00-2	 27 1		0.00-0.99	0	 A 6		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 5	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-5			1.00-1.99	0	В 5						. ,	-			-	-) ~		-
56-8			2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	2
84-1			3.00-3.49	3	D 0									J				-	
Grad	d. 0		3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ſh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
					I 0		Ot1	her					4	_		_			
					? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 379 0101 University of Maryland Title

PRINS/PRACT IN TECH CO Baltimore County

Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10 Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 762 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3 80	1326/1639	3.80	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	3		1444/1639	3.60	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	0		****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33		4.33	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	3	4		1184/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10			4.30	4.05	4.12	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	3	3		1044/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	5		1235/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	3		657/1579		4.05	4.08	4.07	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	1 22	1021/1518	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80			4.71	4.43	4.68	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	3		1083/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5		832/1550			4.22		4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22						4.22
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	_	U	U			2	5	4.22	401/1293	4.22	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	496/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
From	000	. Dict		.+ 4 ~ .	_									

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	rades Rea	asons	Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required fo	or Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 9 .

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING Baltimore County

Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 763

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1406/1583	3.50	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	0	3	3.10	1409/1532	3.10	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1482/1612	3.22	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1463/1579	3.10	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1318/1518	3.90	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	6		1273/1520	4.40	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	1	5		1182/1517	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	5		1259/1550	3.70	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	0	1	4	3.44	1012/1295	3.44	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	0	2		1198/1398	3.29	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	1	0	3		1300/1391	3.14	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	1	3		1056/1388	3.86	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	3.97	****

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

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101 University of Maryland Page 764
Title FEATURE WRITING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 a 1															
1. Did	vou gai:	n new insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50
	_	ructor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	859/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.25
		valuations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	524/1583	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.47
		d readings contrib			0	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	869/1532	3.94	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.94
6. Did	written	assignments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	126/1504	4.87	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.87
7. Was	the gra	ding system clear!	ly expl	ained	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	955/1612	4.13	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.13
8. How	many ti	mes was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	979/1635	4.69	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.69
9. How	would y	ou grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.20
		Lectur	re															
1. Wer	e the in	structor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.67
		ructor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	491/1520		4.71	4.70	4.68	4.92
		material presente		-	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	214/1517		4.24		4.23	4.83
		tures contribute t			4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.75
5. Did	audiovi	sual techniques er	nhance	your understanding	4	10	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1295	***	3.42	3.94	3.95	****
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did	class d	iscussions contrib		what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	380/1398	4.58	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.58
		dents actively er			4	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.92	204/1391		4.39	4.30	4.35	4.92
		_	_	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
		l techniques succe			4	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	***	3.83	3.93	3.97	****
		Self	Daged															
1. Did	self-pa			what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
				Frequ	onat	. Dia	+ v i bı	1+101	_									
				rrequ	епсу	ומדמי	CLID	uc I OI	.1									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				4	Under-a	rad 1	6	Non-	maior	8

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101 University of Maryla
Title Web Content Develop Baltimore County
Instructor: Burgess, Helen Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 23
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	0				
Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	832/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.31
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	393/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.63
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.67
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	1136/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	3.67
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	1	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	977/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	3.86
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	186/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.79
8. How r	many times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	1288/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	4.33
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	527/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1126/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.21
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	837/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	4.79
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4		4.43	700/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.43
		es contribute t			4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	927/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.21
				our understanding	5	4	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	481/1295	***	4.31	3.94		
		Discus	aion															
1 Did /	alace dica			what you learned	a	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	770/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.00
				d to participate	٥	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	662/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.44
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	609/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.56
		echniques succe		d open discussion	9	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	119/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.75
4. Weie	special t	eciniiques succe	SSIUI		J	_	U	U	U	2	0	4.73	119/ 930		4.33	3.93	3.71	4.73
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	 quir	 ed fo	 or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5		2.0	-1		10	- , 0 -	-	_	or adda c	-	-		_	ŭ
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	2
84-150		3.00-3.49	5	D 0			a.	_					011001 9			2.011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	ŭ	2.20 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O±1	her					8	10050110		91			
				1 0		00						0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County

Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE Fall 2007

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 765

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-	General														
1	. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	7	0	3.00	1599/1639	3.76	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.00
2	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	6	2	3.13	1572/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.13
3	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	4	5	3.44	1290/1397	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.44
4	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	4	3.19	1501/1583	3.94	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.19
5	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	4	1	3	2.56	1495/1532	3.62	4.02	4.01	4.05	2.56
6	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	1	5	3	3.00	1415/1504	3.94	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.00
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	1	6	3.44	1428/1612	3.81	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.44
8	. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1175/1635	4.52	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.47
9	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	6	4	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.00
	Lecture														
1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	2	7	3.93	1293/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.93
2	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1115/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.60
3	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	4	3	3.43	1376/1517	4.09	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.43
4	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	4	3	2	2.93	1459/1550	3.77	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.93
5	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1247/1295	2.38	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50
	Discussion														
1	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	4	0	2	2.42	1363/1398	3.80	4.20	4.07	4.13	2.42
2	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1265/1391	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.33
3	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	5	1	5	3.75	1095/1388	4.49	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.75
4	. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.55	3.83	3.93	3.97	****
	Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	n									
C:	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0301 University of Maryla Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL Fall 2007

I

?

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

21

University of Maryland Page 766
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire	

						Frequencies			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 ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	880/1639	3.76	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.27
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	650/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.43
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	196/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.86
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	597/1583	3.94	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.40
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	236/1532	3.62	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.67
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	291/1504	3.94	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.60
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	459/1612	3.81	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.53
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1288/1635	4.52	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.33
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	702/1579	3.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.21
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	919/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.43
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	837/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.79		
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	597/1517	4.09	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	638/1550	3.77	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.50
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	10	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1265/1295	2.38	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1398	3.80	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.83
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1391		4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
		echniques succe		-	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	349/ 958	3.55	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.25
				Frequ	ency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
				_	_													
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								ason	.s			Ту	pe 			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	βh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	P U										_	_						

Other

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

Title Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE Fall 2007

Enrollment: 24

Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 767

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 4 1 4 4.00 1138/1639 3.76 4.05 4.27 4.28 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 2 2 2 3 3.67 1410/1639 3.74 4.09 4.22 4.20 3.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 0 3 4 4.00 973/1397 4.10 4.25 4.28 4.26 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 3 5 4.22 822/1583 3.94 4.22 4.19 4.24 4.22 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 1 3 2 3.63 1168/1532 3.62 4.02 4.01 4.05 3.63 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 4.22 638/1504 3.94 4.30 4.05 4.12 4.22 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 1 1 1 4 3.44 1424/1612 3.81 3.88 4.16 4.12 3.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 884/1635 4.52 4.32 4.65 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 3 4 1 3.75 1170/1579 3.65 4.05 4.08 4.07 3.75 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 745/1518 4.31 4.30 4.43 4.39 4.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 597/1520 4.76 4.71 4.70 4.68 4.89 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 800/1517 4.09 4.24 4.27 4.23 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 2 0 5 3.89 1171/1550 3.77 4.17 4.22 4.20 3.89 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1295 2.38 3.42 3.94 3.95 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. 0 0 1 1 4 4.14 708/1398 3.80 4.20 4.07 4.13 4.14

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 1 4 4.43 678/1391 4.25 4.39 4.30 4.35 4.43 2 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 435/1388 4.49 4.47 4.28 4.34 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 1 3 1 0 2 2.86 884/958 3.55 3.83 3.93 3.97 2.86

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101 University of Maryland Page 768
Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 3

	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	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	718/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	5.00

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

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Fall 2007 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K Enrollment: 3

Page 769 University of Maryland FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

(Duestionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
,	uescionnaires.	3	Scudenc	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0		1410/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0		1324/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	774/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		1044/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67
y. non would jou grade one everall economing erroserveness	ŭ	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ū	_	_	1.07	211,13,7	1110	1.00	1.00	1.07	1.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1419/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1328/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	5.00
-														
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
-	-													

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401 University of Maryland Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: MABE, MITZI J 3

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 770

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1410/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1604/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	1.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	569/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1033/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1292/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	832/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1293/1295	1.00	3.42	3.94	3.95	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	1	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	3				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 0501	University of Maryland	Page 771
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
T	MADE MIRET I	n-11 000F	T-1- TDDD 2000

Job IRBR3029 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J Fall 2007

Enrollment:	2					
Ouestionnaires:	1		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	cructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1595/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	5.00

Credits E	arned	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	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	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	l
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0601 University of Maryland TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County

Page 772 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	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	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1399/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1414/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958		3.83	3.93	3.97	4.50
Errom		. Diat	- m i bı	.+ :	_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	2				
				?	1						

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701 University of Maryland Page 773 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions						NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	5.00
	_	questions reflec		_	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	3.75	4.02	4.01		4.00
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
		ıg system clearl		ined	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1			1135/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65		4.50
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	889/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.00
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.07		4.43	4.39	
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1520	4.81		4.70	4.68	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0		1		4.50		4.02		4.27		4.50
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	0		0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1398		4.20			
				d to participate	0		0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Required for Majors 0				0	Graduate	· · · · · ·	0	Majo	r r	2		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	l				0	Under-gr	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	0 0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0							3				-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0	DICCCIVED 0				response				_					
				I O	I 0 Other 2		2	-										
				? 0														

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

TUTORIAL IN WRITING MCGURRIN JR, AN Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

2

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801 University of Maryland Page 774 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies				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	4.00	1138/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1579/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Questionnaires: 3

Course-Section	: ENGL 392 0901	University of Maryland	Page 775
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	MCGURRIN JR, AN	Fall 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncies	;	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the	instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1532/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.00
6. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67
1 77 63		Lectur			1	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.50	007/1510	4 07	4 20	4.43	4 20	4 50
		ctor's lecture	_	-	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	Τ		807/1518	4.07	4.30		4.39 4.68	4.50
		tor seem inter		3	1 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70		5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1	0		1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	U	U	U	0	2	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
				to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
		-	_	open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
		3		-														
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Red	guire	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	1
28-55							-			_								
56-83						Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	2
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0													3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
								_	-		_	111canc						

Other

3

I 0 ? 1

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

Title SIMS, DIANA Fall 2007 Instructor: Enrollment: 23

FIII OIIIIIEIIC.	43				
Questionnaires:	17	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

I

0

0

				_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	797/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	5		1350/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	859/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	751/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	430/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	d 0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	351/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1316/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1135/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	818/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1337/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	961/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1		2	5	4	3.77	1256/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1144/1550		4.17	4.22	4.20	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	776/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2		4.11	-,	3.88	4.20	4.07		4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44		4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11			4.47	4.28		4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	769/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.40
Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Re	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 7														
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 2 C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	15
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0									3					
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	ſh

Other

13

Page 776

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201 University of Maryland TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County Fall 2007

Title Instructor: SIMS, DIANA

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 777

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	1	6	4.00	1138/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1300/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1219/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	960/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	1176/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	506/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	1	2	3.00	1519/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1366/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	889/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	8	2	3.77	1364/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1222/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1256/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1262/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	731/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	695/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1106/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	887/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	577/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.80
Frem	ency	Dist	-rih	ıtioı	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301 University of Maryland Page 778
Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R Fall 2007
Enrollment: 26

	Ouestionnaires:	16	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair
--	-----------------	----	----------------	------------	--------------

		0			NTD	377		_	ncies		_		ructor		Dept			
		Questior	1S 		NR	NA			3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	6	0	6	3	1	2.56	1628/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.56
		ctor make clear			0	0	3	4	5	3	1		1617/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	2.69
		uestions reflec			0	14	0	0	1	1			****/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	****
	_	uations reflect			0		1	5	3	4			1501/1583			4.19		3.19
				what you learned	0	6	1	2	5	2	0	2.80	1471/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	2.80
	_	_		to what you learned	0	1	2	1	4	6	2	3.33	1303/1504	4.12		4.05	4.12	3.33
		g system clearl		2	0	1	5	2	6				1578/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	2.47
	_	was class cand			0	0	2	3	3				1617/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	3.13
	-			ching effectiveness	5	0	4	3	3	1			1571/1579			4.08	4.07	2.09
		Lectur	-	,	_		_	_	_		_							
		uctor's lecture			0			2	6	3			1468/1518					
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0			5			1509/1520			4.70	4.68	3.19
				explained clearly	0				3				1424/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	3.25
		es contribute t		-	0	-	5	-					1513/1550		4.17		4.20	2.19
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques er	hance y	your understanding	1	1	1	3	3	6	1	3.21	1117/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.21
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	8	0	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	1357/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	2.50
				ed to participate	7	0	2	1	1	3			1286/1391		4.39		4.35	
				nd open discussion	7	0	2	1	3				1343/1388					
		echniques succe			7	3			3				725/ 958					
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trıb	utioi	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		 Re	anir	 ed f	or Ma	ajors		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99		B 2		1/6/	dutt.	-u 1	J_ 1'10	2015		_	Graduat	_	J	1.10) (J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	major	16
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			a	_				_	011001 9			2.021		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
	-	2.22 2.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Other					12							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401

26

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

Page 779 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	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	3	6	6	6	3.59	1458/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	9	8	4.00	1090/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	822/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1023/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	775/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1109/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	13	4	3.95	1533/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	1	7	11	1	3.48	1331/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	877/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4				1299/1520			4.70	4.68	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4				999/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	5			1285/1550		4.17	4.22	4.20	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	289/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	1	3 25	****/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	1	0	2		****/1391		4.39	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	0	1	2		****/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0			****/ 958			3.93	3.97	****
_														
Freq	uency	, Dis	trib	at 101	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 16		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	 aior	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3			1					-		-	-			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Ge	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	22
84-150 19 3.00-3.49 8 D 0									3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0									respons				_	
I 0		Ot	her				2	1						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Title TECHNICAL WRITING
Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

Page 780 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Žucaciona														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	10	4		1266/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	748/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	2	6	3		1131/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	751/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	729/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8		4.41	478/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3		4.35	694/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 1	0	0	0	3 2	13 11			1572/1635	4.21 3.78	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Τ	U	U	U	2	11	3	4.06	853/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	947/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	648/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	405/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	4		4.20	944/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1209/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	916/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1106/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	***
Cominou														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.08	****
• •														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	***

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501

Title TECHNICAL WRITING Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 780 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701 University of Maryla Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County Instructor: HESS, LAURIE Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 781
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24			
Questionnaires:	19	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions			NID	NT 70	Fre	equer 2	ncies		_		tructor		_		Level			
		Questions	; 		NR	NA			3	-4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	mean	Mean	mean
		General																
1. Did vou	gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1138/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	8	7		959/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.16
		estions reflect			0	11	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	795/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.25
		ations reflect			0	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	781/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.26
				what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	544/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.29
6. Did writ	ten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	404/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.47
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	860/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.21
8. How many	y times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	1056/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.61
9. How woul	ld you g	grade the overal	l tead	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	795/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.13
		Lecture	:															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					4	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1293/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				4	0	1	0	1	2	11		1222/1520	4.37	4.71		4.68	4.47	
		_		explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	5	8		875/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.27
		es contribute to		-	4	0	1	0	3	5	6		1077/1550		4.17	4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did audi	iovisual	. techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	4	1	1	0	6	1	6	3.79	819/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.79
		Discuss																
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1398		4.20	4.07		****
				ed to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1391		4.39		4.35	****
		_		nd open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were spe	ecial te	chniques succes	sful		16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****
		Laborat	_			_		_	_	_	_							
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understar	ding o	of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
_					-	.,												
Fre				Frequ	lency	Dist	rıbı	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors		
00.07														0			1	
00-27					Rec	<u>auir</u>	eu I	or Ma	Jor	S	U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	ır.	1	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 1					1	Under-a	rad 1	9	Non-	-maior	18		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County Instructor: MEADE, VICKI Fall 2007

Enrollment:

17

University of Maryland Page 782

Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Ouestionnaires: 12 Stud	dent Course Evaluation Questionnaire
-------------------------	--------------------------------------

Quagtions						-	ncies	;			tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															,	
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	2	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1553/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.30
		ctor make clear			2	0	2	0	2	1	5		1388/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.70
		estions reflect		_	2	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	****
	_	ations reflect		_	2	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1226/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.80
				what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1388/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.11
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ined	3	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	965/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.11
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	lled		3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1318/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.50
		Lecture	:															
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	well	prepared	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1318/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.90
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1397/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.10
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1347/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.50
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1393/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.30
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	3	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	623/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.00
		Discuss																
				what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	994/1398		4.20	4.07	4.13	3.71
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	2		1094/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.86
		_		d open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	1	3		1165/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.57
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		5	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	798/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.29
		Field W							_	_								
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribut	e to w	hat you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****
Freque					ency	niet	-rih	1+ i 01	n									
treda								20101										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	;			Ty	pe			Majors	}
														- 				
00-27	27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4				Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5	•													
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	11			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives					0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	: enoug	ŗh		

Other

0

0

0

Ρ

I

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore Count Instructor: HESS, LAURIE Fall 2007

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 18

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1001

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 783

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA		_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		
1 1		Genera			0	•	0	0	_	_	0	4 22	014/1620	2 00	4 05	4 05	4 00	4 22
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	814/1639			4.27	4.28	4.33
		ctor make clear			1	7	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	877/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.24
	_	uestions reflec		_	1	1	-	-	1	3	6	4.50	517/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50
		uations reflect		1 5	0	U T	0 1	0	2	5	10	4.47	512/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.47
	_	_		what you learned	0	•	0	0	2 2	4	11 10	4.33	,		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.33
		_		o what you learned	•	0	-	-	4	6			441/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	4.44
		g system clearl		inea	0	0	1	0	0		11	4.22	, -		3.88	4.16	4.12	4.22
		was class canc			1	-	0	-	-	5	12		958/1635			4.65		4.71
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1133/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.80
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1293/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.93
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1305/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.36
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			xplained clearly	4		0		3	5	6	4.21	928/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.21
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	690/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.46
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	1	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	709/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.92
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	908/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.86
				d to participate	11		0	0	2	3			,			4.30	4.35	4.00
		-	_	d open discussion	11	0	0			3			944/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	
		echniques succe			11	2	0	0	2	0	3		380/ 958		3.83		3.97	
				Frequ	iency	n Dis	trib	ut i oı	n									
				_	201107	210	0112		-									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	.jor	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			-			-						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	rh
				P 0									respons					•
				I 0		Ot]	her				1	.2	-		5			

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1101 University of Maryland Page 784
Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 19

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

Questionnaires: 13

					ND :			-	ncies		_		tructor		Dept			
		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	1	2	4	5	4.08	1082/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.08
		ctor make clear			1		0	1	1	3	7	4.33	774/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33
		uestions reflec		_	2	4	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	767/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.29
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	476/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	655/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.17
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.33
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	617/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.42
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1579/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.83
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	569/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1021/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1264/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.42
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	405/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.67
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			1	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	972/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.17	
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	6	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1158/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		9	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****
				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 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1201

23

TECHNICAL WRITING

ROCKETT, DANIKA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

Page 785 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Fr	eque	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 г	nid von	gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4 12	1055/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.12
	_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	877/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	4.24
			uestions reflec			0	6	1	1	1	4	4		1144/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	3.82
		_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	4	4	9		751/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.29
					what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	5		1195/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	3.59
					o what you learned	-	0	0	1	4	4	8				4.30	4.05	4.12	4.12
			g system clearl		_	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44			3.88	4.16	4.12	4.44
			was class canc		11100	1	0	0	0	0	12	4		1350/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	4.25
		-			hing effectivenes:	_	0	0	0	2	6	_	4.29	623/1579		4.05	4.08	4.07	4.29
٠		.zu /ou :	grade one overa	0000	iiiiig diliddiliddi.		ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ū	1.25	023, 23,7	3.70	1.00	1.00	1.07	1.27
			Lectur	е															
1. V	Were th	e instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	1069/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. I	oid the	instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	872/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.77
3. V	Was lec	ture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	928/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.21
4. I	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		you learned	3	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1254/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.71		
5. I	oid aud	liovisua	ovisual techniques enhance your understandir		our understanding	5	5	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	943/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.57
			Discus	sion															
1. [Did cla	ss disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	****
2. V	Were al	l stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
3. I	Did the	instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	****
4. V	Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****
					Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Cred	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	3	Reasons				ТУ	pe			Majors	3			
00-	 -27	0	0.00-0.99	 1	A 9		 Re	anir	ed f	 or M	ajor		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		110	dutt.	cu I	O1 11	الماري	_	_	Graduat	_	0	ra J	, <u>.</u>	U
56-		8	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
	-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		00.	u	-				•	CIIGCI 9			11011		- '
Gra		0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
010		•	3.30 1.30	-	P 0			-001					-	respons					,
					I 0		O+	her				1	.2					-	
					? 0							_							
					• •														

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 786 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	1 60	508/1639	4.66	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1 0	2	4	4.60 4.60	415/1639	4.80	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1397		4.09	4.22	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	597/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1532		4.02	4.19	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612		3.88	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635		4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579		4.05	4.08	4.07	4.50
or non-nouth for grade one overall codoning directiveness	_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	_	1.50	302, 23.7	1.05	1.05	1.00	1.07	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	4.93	4.30	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	474/1517	4.66	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.76	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	838/1295	3.48	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398		4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391		4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	4.90	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.53	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.67
- 1 · · ·														
Laboratory			•	0	•	-	_	4 00	****/ 224	als als als als	als als als als	4 10	4 06	ale ale ale ale
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0 1	4.00	****/ 224 ****/ 240	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	~~~/ 240			4.11	4.08	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.27	4.58	4.50	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82		3.65	4.52	4.59	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78		3.70	4.47	4.60	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80		3.97	4.47	4.65	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 82		3.64	4.16	4.08	4.50
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	32/ 52	4.00	4.48	4.04	4.78	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 42	4.50	4.42	4.75	4.63	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50		5.00	4.45	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43		5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32		5.00	4.37	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201
Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 786 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0301 University of Maryland Page 787
Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA Fall 2007
Enrollment: 8

Ouestionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescionnaires	,	Deddelle	COULDC	DValuation	Queberonnarie

							Fre	_	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	new insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.66	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.71
	1 0	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	4.80	4.09	4.22	4.20	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.83
	-	uations reflect		-	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	476/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	-,		4.02	4.01	4.05	4.71
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.71			4.30	4.05	4.12	
		ng system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.71			3.88	4.16	4.12	4.71
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1215/1635	4.71	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.43
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1			137/1579			4.08	4.07	4.80
		Lectur					_			_	_		005/4540					
		ructor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	,			4.43	4.39	4.86
		ctor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520		4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2			347/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	4.71
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.71	. ,		4.17		4.20	4.71
5. Did	audiovisua	ıl techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1122/1295	3.48	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.63	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.60
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	4.80	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.60
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388		4.47	4.28	4.34	4.80
		echniques succe		a open alboabbion	2	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.40	267/ 958			3.93	3.97	4.40
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Red	anire	 -d fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1)		_	or addac	-	-		-	ŭ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	-major	7
84-150	_	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								-					5	•
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ah
	-	2.22 2.00	=	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		O+1	ner					6					-	
				? 0		001						-						

Course-Section: ENGL 394 0101 University of Maryland TECHNICAL EDITING Baltimore County

Title Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R (Instr. A) Fall 2007 Page 788

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	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	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1630/1639	2.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	0	0		1613/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	2.75
		uestions reflect			0	1	0	0	0	3	0		973/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	3	0	1		1406/1583		4.22	4.19	4.24	3.50
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	0	0		1516/1532		4.02	4.01	4.05	2.25
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0		1340/1504		4.30	4.05	4.12	3.25
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.00	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.33	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.33
1 Were	a the instr	Lecture uctor's lectures		orenared	Λ	0	0	0	2	2	Λ	3 50	1419/1518	3.25	4.30	1 13	4.39	3.25
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1465/1520		4.71	4.70	4.68	3.38
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	0		1424/1517		4.24	4.27	4.23	3.13
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	2	0	2	-		1440/1550		4.17	4.22	4.20	2.50
				our understanding	0	0	0	2	0	2			1158/1295		3.42			2.50
			2	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	-	-	-	_	-	_	-							
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.67
2. Were	e all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.33
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.67
4. Were	e special t	echniques succes	ssful		1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	1.00	3.83	3.93	3.97	1.00
				Frequ	onat	, Dia	t wib	1+ i 01	^									
				riequ	terrey	DIS	CLID	10101	.1									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	- – – – S	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		_				J						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0
84-150		3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	јh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 394 0101 University of Maryland Page 789 Title TECHNICAL EDITING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1630/1639	2.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1613/1639	2.75	4.09	4.22	4.20	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1406/1583	3.50	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1516/1532	2.25	4.02	4.01	4.05	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1340/1504	3.25	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.00	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1481/1518	3.25	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1512/1520	3.38	4.71	4.70	4.68	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.13	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	2.50	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	1.00	3.83	3.93	3.97	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101 University of Maryland Title WRITING INTERNSHIP Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 790 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

								T	b	G	Damb	IMDO	T 1	0
Ouestions	MP	NA	1	eque. 2	ncies 3	; Д	5	Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Mean	Sect
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1205/1583	3.83	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	714/1532	4.08	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	932/1504	3.92	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.92	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1208/1579	3.80	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1141/1518	4.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1520	4.54	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	947/1517	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1297/1550	3.61	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1247/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	25/ 52	4.73	4.48	4.04	4.78	4.73
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	29/ 53	4.18	4.18	4.05	4.31	4.18
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	3	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	36/ 42	4.38	4.42	4.75	4.63	4.38
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	34/ 37	3.80	3.80	4.58	4.52	3.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.00
Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Fynested Crades				P.O.	aconc				Тът	20			Majorg	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101 Title

University of Maryland WRITING INTERNSHIP Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 791 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.1
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1205/1583	3.83	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	714/1532	4.08	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.0
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	932/1504	3.92	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.9
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.8
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.92	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($	2	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1056/1579	3.80	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.8
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1094/1518	4.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.2
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1292/1520	4.54	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.5
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1007/1517	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.1
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1289/1550	3.61	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.6
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1247/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.5
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.6
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.6
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.6
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.3
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	25/ 52	4.73	4.48	4.04	4.78	4.7
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	29/ 53	4.18	4.18	4.05	4.31	4.1
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	3	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	36/ 42	4.38	4.42	4.75	4.63	4.3
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	34/ 37	3.80	3.80	4.58	4.52	3.8
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.0
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 `s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101 University of Maryland Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 792

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1639	4.68	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.92
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	349/1639		4.09	4.22	4.29	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1397	4.82	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.75
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	173/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.83
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	236/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.67
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	182/1504	4.71	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.75
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	718/1612	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.33
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.40	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.25
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.56
1 77	1	Lectur	-		_	0	0	^	0	_	0	4 00	260/1510	4 72	4 20	4 42	4 51	4 00
		uctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1518 1/1520		4.30	4.43		4.80
		ctor seem inter		n the subject xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0 4	10 5	4.30	,		4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
		teriai presente es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	424/1550		4.24	4.27	4.34	4.30 4.70
				our understanding	2	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	825/1295		3.42	3.94		3.78
5. Did au	uiovisua.	r techniques en	nance y	our understanding	۷	1	U	U	4	3	2	3.70	025/1295	3.09	3.42	3.94	4.01	3.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.33
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.83	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.67
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	496/1388	4.83	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.67
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	786/ 958	3.94	3.83	3.93	4.24	3.33
				Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trib	ut i oi	n									
				11040	.01107	210	0112	u010.										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			-			-						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her				1	.2						

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

Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 793

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

					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 fr	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	698/1639	4.68	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructo	J ,		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	231/1639	4.72	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.78
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	175/1397	4.82	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.89
4. Did other evaluat	ions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	151/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.89
5. Did assigned read			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	165/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.78
6. Did written assig	nments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	245/1504	4.71	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.67
7. Was the grading s	system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	718/1612	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.33
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1101/1635	4.40	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.56
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	691/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.22
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct		l prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	602/1518	4.73	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1033/1520		4.71	4.70	4.75	4.67
3. Was lecture mater		3	0	0	1	0	0	5	3		1083/1517	4.15	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.00
	contribute to what		0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	716/1550		4.17	4.22	4.24	4.44
5. Did audiovisual t		-	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	623/1295		3.42	3.94	4.01	4.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss		o what you learned	Ο	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.33
2. Were all students		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1391	4.83	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructo	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1388		4.47	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special tech	_	ana open arboabbron	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	190/ 958		3.83	3.93	4.24	4.56
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

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

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 794

Student	Course	Evaluation	ı Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

			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	Λ	0	0	0	Λ	2	6	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3		1274/1639	3.89	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0		****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	٥	0	1	0	2	3	2		1247/1583	3.78	4.22	4.19	4.31	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	165/1532	4.78	4.02	4.19	4.07	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	7		1034/1504	3.78	4.02	4.01	4.07	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	1	1	2		1455/1612	3.70	3.88	4.05	4.20	3.76
3 3 1 1 1	0	0	0	0	0	6 6	3		1288/1635	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	•	0	0	-	1	0	3		,					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	0	Т	3	3	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	****	4.71	4.70	4.75	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1517	****	4.24	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1550	****	4.17	4.22	4.24	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	Ο	1	6	4.86	40/ 85	4.86	4.27	4.58	4.83	4.86
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	36/ 82	4.75	3.65	4.52	4.49	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	66/ 78	3.88	3.70	4.47	4.56	3.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	51/ 80	4.38	3.70	4.47	4.59	4.38
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2.71	74/ 82	2.71	3.64	4.16	4.02	2.71
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	Т	Т	Т	3	Τ	Т	Т	Z./1	74/ 82	∠./⊥	3.04	4.10	4.02	∠./⊥
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	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	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101 Title

LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY

Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 795 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	281/1639	4.79	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	295/1639	4.71	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	203/1532	4.71	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	163/1504	4.79	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	996/1612	4.07	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	943/1635	4.71	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	156/1550	4.92	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.20	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	75/ 958	4.90	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.90
Seminar														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4 07	4 50	4 02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	7		****/ 82	****	4.27 3.65	4.58 4.52	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.49	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 80	****	3.70	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****
5. Here directia for grading made crear	12	U	U	_	_	J	J	2.50	, 02		J.01	1.10	1.02	

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 796

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

GWIAZDA, PIOTR

Instructor:

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1639	4.92	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	316/1639	4.69	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	168/1583	4.85	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	84/1532	4.92	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5		4.62	283/1504		4.30	4.05	4.20	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	207/1612		3.88	4.16	4.18	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1056/1635	4.62	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.80
Lecture						_					4 00			
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	11	4.92	191/1518		4.30	4.43	4.51	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	11	4.92	141/1517	4.92	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.17	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	190/ 958	4.56	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.50	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	3.70	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	ΤÜ	U	U	U	U	Т	4	4.0/	/ 82		3.04	4.10	4.02	.,
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: ENGL 471 0101 University of Maryland Page 797 Title ADV CREATIVE WRTNG:FIC Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ROWELL, JOHN

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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 vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	_	this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	561/1639	4.56	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.56
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.56
		estions reflect	_	_	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.33
	_	ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.67
			_	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	113/1532	4.89	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.89
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	169/1504	4.78	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.78
		system clearly		-	1	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	669/1612	4.38	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.38
		was class cance	-		1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.72	5.00
	-			ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.67
1 Wara +	ho inatru	Lecture ctor's lectures		ropared	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.57
		tor seem interes			3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.71	4.43	4.75	4.86
				plained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	4		510/1517	4.57	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.57
		eriai presented s contribute to			3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.24	4.27		4.86
			_	ur understanding	4	3	0	1	0	1	1		894/1295	3.67	3.42	3.94		
5. Did au	.arovisuar	techniques em	nance yo	ur understanding	4	3	U	Τ	U	1	1	3.07	894/1295	3.67	3.42	3.94	4.01	3.07
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ate to w	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	172/1398	4.89	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.89
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.89
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage f	fair and	open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.67
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		1	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.25
				Enom		, Dist	- mi bi	.+	_									
				rrequ	iency	DISC	LIID	10101	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 guire	ed f	or Ma	ijors	 s	2	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	 or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						J						5		-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С 0		Ger	nera:	L				4	Under-gr	rad 1	0	Non-	-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5-					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ıh
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 486 0101 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO Baltimore County

Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2007

Page 798 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect
Questions	NK 	NA	 			- 4		mean	капк	Mean	mean	mean	mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	366/1639	4.71	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.02	4.01	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	913/1612	4.17	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1579	4.83	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.83
Lecture	2	•	0	0	0	-	_	4 55	454/1510	4 55	4 20	4 40	4 51	4 55
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	Ţ	3	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	U	0	0	Τ	3	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.20	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.83	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.75
•														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ıt.i.or	า									
11040					-									

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

Course-Section: ENGL 490 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV TOPICS IN ENGL LAN Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 799

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.09	4.22	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	447/1397	4.57	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.02	4.01	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1504	4.86	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	603/1612	4.43	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.17	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	346/1295	4.40	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.83	3.93	4.24	5.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	}

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 493 0101

14

SEMINAR IN CT

BURGESS, HELEN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Page 800 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	_	ncies	:		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skill	s from this co	urse	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	293/1639	4.78	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.78
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear t	he expected go	als	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.56
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect	the expected g	oals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.86
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect t	he expected go	als	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1583	4.78	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.78
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribut	e to what you	learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	165/1532	4.78	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.78
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contrib	oute to what yo	u learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	329/1504	4.56	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.56
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	explained		0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	848/1612	4.22	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.22
		was class cancel			2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1576/1635	3.86	4.32	4.65	4.72	3.86
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall	teaching effe	ctiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1579	4.88	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.88
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared		2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem interes	sted in the sub	ject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	and explained	clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what you learn	ed	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.86
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enha	nce your under	standing	3	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.00
		Discussi	on															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribut	e to what you	learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.75
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively enco	ouraged to part	icipate	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.75
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage fa	air and open di	scussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.88
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques success	ful		1	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.60
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant t	to the announce	d theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available fo	or individual a	ttention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribut	e to what you	learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute to	what you lear	ned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	clear		8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expect	ed Grades				Rea	asons	1			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A	 6				 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B	3		re	quil	eu I	J⊥ Md	י זטני	5	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC) _	O
20-55	U	1.00-1.99	о в	3				_						_			_	

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