Course-Section: ENGL 100 1 Composition Bloom,Ryan I

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

23

University of Maryland Page 628 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

								equei		s .			tructor	Course	_		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	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	1174/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.94
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	589/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the exp	pected goals	0	14	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	726/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to wl	nat you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	611/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.24
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	430/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.41
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	499/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.47
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1054/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.53
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	489/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	559/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.94
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and exp	plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	232/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.81
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	558/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.59
5. Did au	l audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					1	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	545/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.19
1. Did cla	Discussion lass discussions contribute to what you learn					0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	201/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.81
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	533/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.56
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	165/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.94
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	229/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.47
		Self	Paced															
3. Were y	our conta	cts with the i	nstructo:	helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the	e feedbac	k/tutoring by	proctors	helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 28-55	6 1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	2 0	A 5 B 9		Re	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	S	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Co	nera:	ı			1	4	Under-q	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		GC.	iici a.	_				-	onder g	Lau I	. /	INOII	ilia joi	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		ъ1.	ectiv	7A C				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.1	CCCI	,					respons				_	
				I 0		O+1	her					0	Tespons	CD CO L	c argi.	ııııcaı		
				? 0		UL.	IICI					U						
				: 0														

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Course-Section: ENGL 100 10 University of Maryland Page 629 Title MAR 22, 2010 Composition Instructor: Dunnigan, Brian Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

26

2

D

F

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

84-150

Grad.

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Conoral														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	6	10	4.15	987/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	922/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	240/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	868/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	200/1406		4.04	4.09	4.02	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	2	15	4.40	440/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	823/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	1194/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	438/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	839/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	322/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	592/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	432/1405		4.18	4.32	4.27	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	3	2	4	6	3.69	893/1236			4.00	3.87	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	528/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	344/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	620/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	754/ 873		3.89	4.03	3.89	3.33
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	, 100			1.22	1.11	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	Ü	0	0	0	U	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
Frequ	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
						~			m	n 0			Mada	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				кеа	ason	ಶ 			Ту	 pe			Majors	; . – – – –
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 10 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0		Go	nera	1			1	1	Under-g	rad ?	20	Non-	-major	20
50-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 0 0		Ge	iiet d	_			Т		onder-9	rau Z	U	MOII-	ilia JOE	∠∪

Electives

0

- Means there are not enough

I

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 11

Composition

25

Brofman, Margare

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Page 630 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	N	ΔV	Fre	equei 2	ncie: 3	s 4	5	Ins [*] Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sec
General	0		0	0	1	_	0	4	2 55	1204/1500	2 75	4 05	4 21	4 10	2 1
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0		0	2	1	5	8	4		1384/1509		4.05		4.18	3.5
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1 1	1	0 11	0	1	3 1	10 4	5 2		1086/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25 4.24	4.0 3.8
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	1036/1287 667/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	4.3
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2		0	1	1	8	6	2		1243/1406			4.09	4.02	3.
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			0	0	1	0				403/1384		4.27			4.
. Was the grading system clearly explained	2		0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28			3.90	4.17	4.20	4.
. How many times was class cancelled	2		0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506					5.
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	1	6	6	4		1092/1463				4.02	
Lecture															
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2		0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	1188/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2		0	0	0	0	5	13		933/1421		4.68	4.73	4.66	4.
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2		0	0	4	1	8	5	3.78	1197/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	3.
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3		0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1141/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	11	2	1	4	0	0	2.29	1211/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	2.
Discussion															
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5		0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1034/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	3.
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4		0	2	0	3	5	6		1032/1255		4.40	4.33	4.15	3.
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4		0	1	3	0	5	7		1025/1258			4.38		3.
Were special techniques successful	5		8	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	765/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.
Laboratory	1.0		^	0	1	0	1	0	2 00	**** / 100	****	****	4 00	4 1 4	* *
 Were you provided with adequate background information Did the lab instructor provide assistance 	18		0 1	0	1	0	1 1	0		****/ 198 ****/ 177		****	4.22	4.14 4.29	**
-			-	Ü	Ü	ŭ	-	Ū	1.00	, 1			1.50	1.27	
Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	**
. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	* *
. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	* *
. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	**
. Were criteria for grading made clear	19		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	**
Field Work															
. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48		****	4.41	4.29	* *
. Was the instructor available for consultation	19		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	* *
Self Paced					•		_	•						4 00	
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19 19		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 49 ****/ 46		****	4.26	4.28 4.52	* *
. Were your contacts with the instructor heipful	19		U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	****/ 40			4.31	4.52	
Free	quency	y I	Dist	ribu	tio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade:	5				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 8 0.00-0.99 0 A 10			Req	uire	d fo	or Ma	ajor	`s	3	 Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 9			~	_				_		1	, -	0			-
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0			Gen	eral				1	.7	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0															

Other

0

P

0 0 ? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 631

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 14

Composition

Brofman, Margare

Title

Instructor:

Quescionnaii	CD: 12	Student Cot	TT DC	плати	uati	OII QU	10001	.011110	XII C	:						
					Fr	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA		2			5	Mean			_		Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you g	ain new insights, skills from	this course	0	0	2	5	3	2	0	2.42	1504/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	2.42
2. Did the i	nstructor make clear the exp	ected goals	0	0	2	3	6	1	0	2.50	1499/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	2.50
3. Did the e	xam questions reflect the ex	pected goals	0	4	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	1279/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	2.75
4. Did other	evaluations reflect the exp	ected goals	0	0	1		3	4	2	3.33	1367/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	3.33
5. Did assig	ned readings contribute to w	hat you learned	0	0	3	2	-	4	0	2.67	1381/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	2.67
6. Did writt	en assignments contribute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0		1	3	3.25	1286/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	3.25
7. Was the g	rading system clearly explai	ned	0	1	0	3	1	5	2	3.55	1287/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.55
8. How many	times was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	990/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.60
9. How would	you grade the overall teach	ing effectiveness	4	1	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	1448/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	2.43
	Lecture															
1. Were the	instructor's lectures well p	repared	0	0	2	3	3	1	3	3.00	1406/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	3.00
2. Did the i	nstructor seem interested in	the subject	0	0	0	4	2	2	4	3.50	1396/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	3.50
3. Was lectu	re material presented and ex	plained clearly	0	0	3	2	4	0	3	2.83	1383/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	2.83
4. Did the l	ectures contribute to what y	ou learned	0	0	4	1	5	1	1	2.50	1388/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	2.50
5. Did audio	visual techniques enhance yo	our understanding	0	7	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1174/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	2.80
	Discussion															
1. Did class	discussions contribute to w	hat you learned	6	0	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	1253/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	2.17
2. Were all	students actively encouraged	l to participate	6	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1241/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	2.50
3. Did the i	nstructor encourage fair and	l open discussion	6	0	4	0	1	1	0	1.83	1258/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	1.83
4. Were spec	ial techniques successful	_	6	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	853/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	2.50
	Laboratory															
1. Did the l	ab increase understanding of	the material	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	***
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Crodita Farm	od Cum CDA	Ermogted Creder	_			Des					m	~ 0			Mo io	
Earn	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						sons	; -			Ту	ре 			Majors 	
00-27	5 0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3 1.00-1.99 0	B 6		a		1				0	TTradas a		0	37		1.0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				2	0						

University of Maryland Page 632
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22				
Questionnaires:	20	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 15

Composition

Wilkinson, Rache

Title

Instructor:
Enrollment:

			Er	equei	naia	c		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	724/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	424/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	414/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	291/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	332/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	313/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	5	8	4.05	951/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	16	1	3.95	1422/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	9	7	4.24	648/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	396/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	322/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	456/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	239/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	474/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	377/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	278/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	535/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	570/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.83
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 16

Composition

25

Macek, Philip M.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Page 633 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
1 5 1		Genera		. 1 . 1	0	0	-	-	2		_	2 0 4	1104/1500	2 55	4 05	4 21	4 10	2 04
_	_			om this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	./		1184/1509		4.05	4.31		3.94
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	932/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	4.19
	_			expected goals	0	8 1	1	0	2 2	0 3	5	4.00			4.28	4.30		4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	1	1	3	5	9 4	4.33	686/1459 1178/1406		4.22	4.22	4.11	4.33 3.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	<i>3</i>	2	1					4.04	4.09	4.02	
				o what you learned	0	0	0	4 1	4	5	9 6	3.94	,		4.27	4.11	3.98	3.94
		system clearl		inea	0	0	0	T	0	5 15	-	4.00	,		3.90	4.17	4.20	4.00
		was class cand		.hff		0	0	0	2	T.5	1		1360/1506		4.52	4.67		4.06
9. HOW WOT	uia you g	rade the overa	ill tead	ching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	2	ь	/	4.33	545/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	559/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	614/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.88
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	469/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.63
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69			4.18	4.32		4.69
				your understanding	0	8	2	0	1	1	4		925/1236			4.00		
		1	1															
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrik	what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	558/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.33	
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively er	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	287/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.80	
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	363/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38		4.80
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	essful		1	3	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	526/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.92
		Labora	toru															
2. Were vo	ou provid		-	ground information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
z. were y	ou provru	ca micri aacqac		9104114 11110111401011		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 130					
		Field	Work															
				hat you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	***
2. Did you	u clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	***
4. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
		0-16	D															
1 Did se	lf-paged	Self		what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 49	****	****	4 26	4.28	****
i. Did se.	II paceu	ByBCEM CONCILL	ace co	what you rearned	13	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 40			4.20	1.20	
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı											
Credits Ea	own od	Ermogtod Credes				Des		_			m				Mo io			
E		Cum. GP <i>I</i>	·	Expected Grades				кеа	asons	5 			ту	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 4												,		
56-83							nera:	1			1	.0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I O		Oth	ner					0	-					

? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 634

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 17

Composition

22

Killgallon,Dona

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	6	6	6	3.71	1317/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	201/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	444/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	7	12	4.45	553/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	9	4.00	813/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	639/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	8	11	4.33	674/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	826/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	8	4 26	1063/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	14		1084/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	617/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	896/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	3	6	5	4		1068/1236			4.00	3.87	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	3	4	8	3.94	819/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	5	7	5		1023/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	4	5	7		1021/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	664/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.63
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
•	_													

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 18 University of Maryland Title Composition Baltimore County Instructor: Pekarske, Nicole Fall 2009

Job IRBR3029

Page 635

MAR 22, 2010

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			_					_		_	_			
Ouestions	MD	1 , T, 7,	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5		tructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions		NA				- 1		Mean	Rank 		Mean 	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	1	3.44	1417/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	6	2	3.25	1433/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1236/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	8	3	3.56	1288/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	4	2	3.00	1333/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	899/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	1	3	7	3.56	1279/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	1137/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1187/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1094/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	985/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1234/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1099/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1.0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	002/1260	2 00	4 21	1 11	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10 10	0	0	0	0	2 3	1	4.50	982/1260 575/1255	3.99 4.24	4.21	4.14	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	705/ 873		3.89	4.03	3.89	3.50
1. Note apostal techniques successivi	10	2	U	Ü	5	O	_	3.30	7037 073	3.73	3.05	1.05	3.00	3.30
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
or the conferences merp you outly out from accivition		Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	,			1.52		
Self Paced	1 -	0	0	0	1	0	^	2 00	****/ 40			4 06	4 00	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37 ****/ 30	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	U	U	U	1	U	0	5.00	****/ 30			4.27	4.21	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 18 Title Composition

Instructor: Pekarske, Nicole

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 635 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	 А	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 19

Composition

24

Diallo,Mamadou

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Page 636 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	1	2	2	1	2 21	1507/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	2.21
1 9 ,	-	0	1	- T	3	2	7		1487/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.10	2.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	4	4	1	3				1284/1287	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	-	4	3	1	3	1	T							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	U T	3 4	Τ	3	4	2		1414/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	•	-	3	2	Ţ	3		1378/1406		4.04	4.09	4.02	2.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	Ι	3	3	2		1349/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	2.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	2	0	4	2		1430/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	7	2		1458/1506		4.52	4.67	4.66	3.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	4	2	2	1	2.50	1442/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2 57	1427/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	2.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	3	3	3	2		1415/1421	4.27	4.68	4.73	4.44	2.86
- The state of the	-	-	4	4	2	2	1		- ,	4.22	4.00			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	4		3	1		1395/1411			4.31	4.27	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	2	Ţ	2	2		1392/1405		4.18	4.32	4.27	2.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	Τ	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	1	1	Λ	1	2 00	1257/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	2	0	1		1238/1255		4.40	4.33	4.15	2.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	2	2		1164/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	Τ	1		1	2.50	853/ 873		3.89		3.89	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	/	3	2	U	T	U	1	2.50	053/ 0/3	3.73	3.09	4.03	3.09	2.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Evnested Crades				-	agone				Тъл				Majorg	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6 6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	1						

University of Maryland Page 637
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2

Composition

27

Dunnigan, Brian

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

General General Comparisons General Letture Lord with the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did the instructor's lectures well prepared Did twickles and past interested in the subject Did twickles and past interested in the subject Did the instructor's lectures well prepared Did twickles and past interested in the subject Did the instructor's lectures will prepared Did twickles and past interested in the subject Did the instructor's lectures will prepared Did the instructor's lectures will prepared Discussion D				Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain mew finishts, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor nake clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did on the exam questions reflect the expected goals 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did additionable to written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did additionable to written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did additionable to written assignment to written written assignment to written assignment written assignment to written assignment written assignm	Questions	NR	NA		_			5		_		_			
1. Did you gain mew finishts, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor nake clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did on the exam questions reflect the expected goals 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned reading system clearly explained 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did additionable to written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did additionable to written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did additionable to written assignment to written written assignment to written assignment written assignment to written assignment written assignm															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 2 1 11 4.47 605/1509 4.09 4.13 4.26 4.25 4.47 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 2 3 11 4.56 306/1384 4.21 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1.5 4.56 306/1384 4.21 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.56 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor removage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did audiovisual techniques successful 6. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were explained techniques successful 8. How provided with dequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ***/ 198 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 9. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase contribut		0	0	0	1	2	2	1.0	4 20	756/1500	2 75	4 05	1 21	4 10	4 20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 10 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1287 4.08 4.28 4.30 4.24 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 10 4.50 454/1459 4.17 4.22 4.22 4.11 4.50 5.01 dissigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.81 130/1406 3.83 4.04 4.09 4.02 4.81 6.01 distributed assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.81 130/1406 3.83 4.04 4.09 4.02 4.81 6.01 distributed paragraphs of the material 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1															
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 2. 3. 11. 4.56 306/1384 4.21 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 4. 12. 4.55 386/1384 4.21 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 4. 12. 4.55 845/1506 4.48 4.52 4.67 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. User 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 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 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion for the material for the instructory of the successful for the successful		_	•	-	_	_	_								
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 14 4.81 130/1406 3.83 4.04 4.09 4.02 4.81 6. Did written assignements contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 14 1.44 6.81 130/1406 3.83 4.04 4.09 4.02 4.81 6. Did written assigned clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 0 3 12 4.56 387/1489 4.04 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.56 387/1489 4.04 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.56 387/1489 4.04 3.90 4.07 4.67 4.66 4.57 59. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 3 11 4.44 891/1438 4.27 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.44 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 1 3 11 4.44 891/1438 4.27 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.44 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 376/1421 4.65 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.94 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 0 2 13 4.69 432/1405 4.12 4.18 4.31 4.27 4.49 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04 4.04					-										
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 845/1565 4.48 4.52 4.67 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. The would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. 0 1 0 2 2 10 4.33 545/1463 3.96 4.00 4.09 4.02 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lecture contribute to what you learned 2. Did the lecture contribute to what you learned 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. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 9. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 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 1. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 1. Did presentations con							_								
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 0 0 3 1 2 4.56 387/1889 4.04 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 845/1506 4.48 4.52 4.67 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 0 1 0 2 2 10 4.33 545/1463 3.96 4.00 4.09 4.02 4.33	-														
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 845/1506 4.48 4.52 4.67 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 0 2 2 10 4.33 545/1463 3.96 4.00 4.09 4.02 4.33 **Lecture** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 0 1 3 1 1 4.44 891/1438 4.27 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.44 4. 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.94 4 76/1421 4.66 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.94 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 11 4.44 70/1411 4.22 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.49 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0 0 2 2 18 4.69 4.94 4.01 4.23 4.27 4.69 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 274/1236 3.64 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 **Discussion** 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 230/1260 3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.04 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1.25 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 3 3 3 4.00 442/873 3.73 3.89 4.03 3.89 4.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/194 **** 4.14 4.04 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/194 **** 4.24 4.44 4.14 **** 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.2	-														
Self Paced Sel							-								
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. O 0 1 0 1 3 11 4.44 891/1438 4.27 4.27 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.44 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. O 0 1 0 2 13 4.69 432/1405 4.12 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.69 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. O 0 0 1 0 2 13 4.69 232/1405 4.12 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.69 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Were special techniques material and open discussion 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Were special techniques was understanding of the material 8. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1. Were you provided with adequate background information 1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1. Did the lab instructor variable for individual attention 8. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 1. Did field experience contrib															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. O. O. O. D. D. S. A. S.	7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U		U	2	2	10	1.55	343/1403	3.90	4.00	4.00	1.02	1.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. 0 0 0 1 0 2 2 8 4.50 274/1236 3.64 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 230/1260 3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6. 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8. Were you provided with adequate background information 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 9. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 184 **** 4.48 4.48 4.48 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 4. Did the lab instructor available for individual attention 9. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 189 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 2. Were criteria for grading made clear 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 93 **** 4.63 4.99 **** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 48 **** 4.49 4.31 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 47 **** 4.49 4.31 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluation criteria 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 47 **** 4.49 4.51 4.53	Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0 0 2 1 3 4.69 432/1405 4.12 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.49 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 274/1236 3.64 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 230/1260 3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1258 4.38 4.54 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 3 3 3 4.00 442/873 3.73 3.89 4.03 3.89 4.03 3.89 4.00 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.06 **** 4.20 *	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	891/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0 0 2 2 8 4.50 274/1236 3.64 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.94
Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did class di	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	701/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.44
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 1 0 8 4.78 230/1260 3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.78 2.00 4.00 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	432/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.69
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 230/1260 3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1258 4.38 4.54 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 3 3 3 3 4.00 442/873 3.73 3.89 4.03 3.89 4.00 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	274/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 230/1260 3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.78 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1258 4.38 4.54 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 3 3 3 3 4.00 442/873 3.73 3.89 4.03 3.89 4.00 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Diamonian														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1258 4.38 4.54 4.38 4.18 5.00 Laboratory Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.06 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.36 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.36 4.29 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.49 4.39 3.75 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.41 4.29 **** 5. Self Paced		7	Λ	Ω	Λ	1	Ω	8	4 78	230/1260	3 99	4 21	4 14	3 95	4 78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1258 4.38 4.54 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 3 3 3 3 4.00 442/873 3.73 3.89 4.03 3.89 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.28 4.18 **** 4.18 4.15 **** 4.16 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.0			-	-											
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.48 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 185 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.29 **** 5. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.31 4.41 4.29 **** 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.29 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.31 4.26 ***** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 ***** Self Paced		-	-	-	-	-	•								
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.31 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 ****	-						-			,					
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.16 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.84 4.48 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.49 4.31 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** *** 4.39 3.75 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** *** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 ****	1. Were special deciminates successful	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3	3	5	1.00	112/ 0/3	3.73	3.05	1.05	3.05	1.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.22 4.14 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.48 4.48 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.18 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** Self Paced	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** **** 4.48 4.48 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** **** 4.18 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Pield Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.29 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 ****		15			-	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 177 **** **** 4.36 4.29 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15. 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.41 4.29 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 ****		15		0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme						-	-	_		, -					
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme						-	-	_		,					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 ****	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 ****	Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced		15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced				0	0	0	0	1		,	****				****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced					0	0	0	1			****				****
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 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 5.00 ****/ 93. **** 4.03. 4.06. 3.92. **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 5.00 ****/ 48. **** **** 4.39. 3.75. **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 5.00 ****/ 47. **** **** 4.51. 4.53. **** 17. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.			0	0	0	0	0	1			****				****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced		15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.51 4.53 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced						-		_		,		****			
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.18 4.26 **** Self Paced										, -					
Self Paced										,					
	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
	Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 49 *** *** 4.26 4.28 ****	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.14 4.13 ****					0	0		1			****	****			***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.52 ****						0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****			***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 4.47 ****	-			0		0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****		4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.27 4.21 ****		15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2 Title Composition Instructor:

Questionnaires: 16

Dunnigan, Brian Enrollment: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 637 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 20 Title Composition Instructor: Sentell, James E

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

Page 638 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

gadoromarrob Lo														
			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1		0	0	4	8			987/1509		4.05		4.18	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	1049/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	2			708/1287			4.30		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1				553/1459			4.22	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4			4.16						4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1				269/1384			4.11		4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6			499/1489			4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	10			1287/1506		4.52		4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	452/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.41
Taskuus														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	3	7	0	4 20	1001/1420	4 27	4 07	1 10	1 11	4 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1		9		1021/1438 915/1421		4.27 4.68			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0						830/1411		4.08	4.73	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1		0	0					733/1405					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1		1	1	4				814/1236					
5. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	1	4			4	5	O	3.02	014/1230	3.04	3.70	4.00	3.07	3.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	543/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	2			647/1255				4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4			468/1258				4.18	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	3	4			419/ 873					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184		****	1.10	4.06	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
Seminar	1.0	0	•	0	0	•	-	F 00	****	ale ale ale ale	4 60	4 40	4 21	4.4.4.4.
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 48	****	****	1 20	2 75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	U	U	U	U		U	4.00	40			4.33	3.73	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	***	****	4.26	4.28	****
Freq	ıency	Dis Dis	trib	ution	n									
Quality Francis				-		_			_				24	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 21
Title Composition
Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 639 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Cource	Evaluation	Ougstionna	in
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionna	TT 6

							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		rom this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1184/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.94
2. Did the instruct			0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	652/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.44
4. Did other evalua		_	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	647/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned rea		1 3	0	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1128/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.63
_	_	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	557/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.31
7. Was the grading	_	_	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	254/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.69
8. How many times w			0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1022/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.56
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	820/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.07
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc		Inrepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	348/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture mate		3	0	0	0	1	0		10	4.50	617/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures	-		0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	577/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual		-	1	2	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	888/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.69
	Discussion		_		_		_	_	_							
1. Did class discus		_	3	0	Τ	0	3	2	./	4.08	722/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.08
2. Were all student			3	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	883/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.08
3. Did the instruct	_	and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	486/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful				1	0	Τ	Ι	6	4	4.08	422/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.08
	Fr						n									
Credits Earned						Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	16	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	-	-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 22 University of Maryland Title Composition

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Burns, Margie Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 19

Page 640 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	7	3	3.50	1399/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	1049/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	5	8	4.00	924/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	553/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	776/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	779/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	1	3	10	4.12	906/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	957/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	0	5	7	4.00	1203/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	828/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1161/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	4	5		1241/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	847/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	982/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1084/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1041/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	650/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	***	****	4.48	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 93	***	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 22
Title Composition
Instructor: Burns, Margie
Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 640 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 641

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24	
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 25

Composition

Putzel,Diane

Title

Instructor:

				E-m/	equei	agi o	a		Tnat	tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new i		this course	1	0	0	Λ	5	Ω	5	4 00	1114/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor	5 ,		1	0	0	3	2	3	10		1002/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam quest	-	_	0	15	0	0	1	0	3		****/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluati			1	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	, -	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readi	-	_	1	2	3	3	3	4	3		1324/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.06
6. Did written assign	_	-	1	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	779/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading sy		-	1	1	1	3	3	5	5		1271/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.59
8. How many times was			0	0	0	0	1	15	3	4.11	1346/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grad	de the overall teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	668/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.21
1. Were the instructo	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	1	7	10	4.50	800/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	6	12	4.67	1014/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.67
Was lecture materi	al presented and ex	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	482/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.61
4. Did the lectures of	contribute to what y	you learned	1	0	0	2	1	6	9	4.22	919/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.22
5. Did audiovisual te	echniques enhance yo	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	421/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.33
1 544 -1	Discussion	3	2	0	0	1	4	-	4	2 00	000/1060	2 00	4 01	4 1 4	2 05	2 00
1. Did class discussi		-	3	0	0	1	4	/	4	3.88	880/1260		4.21	4.14	3.95	3.88
2. Were all students	1		3	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	690/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.38
3. Did the instructor	_	open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.67	507/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techr	ilques successiui		3	Τ	U	U	3	9	3	4.00	442/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.00
1. Did the lab increa	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****		
	Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
	_															
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	15	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	=		-	
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 5 University of Maryland Page 642 Title Composition Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Terhorst II,Ray Fall 2009 Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions						NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did	. goin now	Genera insights,ski	_	m this source	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	800/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.33
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	234/1509		4.13	4.26	4.16	4.33
		stions reflec		_	1	10	0	0	0	1	6	4.76	167/1287		4.13	4.30	4.24	4.76
	_	tions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	173/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	4.78
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	462/1406		4.04	4.09	4.02	4.39
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	96/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	4.83
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	,		3.90	4.11	4.20	4.61
		as class cand		illed	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506		4.52	4.67	4.66	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56			4.00	4.07	4.02	4.56
9. HOW WOO	ara you gr	ade the overa	.ii teat.	illing effectiveness	2	U	U	U		5	10	4.50	2/0/1403	3.90	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.50
		Lectur																
		tor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	247/1438		4.27	4.46	4.44	4.89
		or seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421		4.68	4.73	4.66	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82			4.24	4.31	4.27	4.82
		contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	459/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	298/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.47
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.90	
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255		4.40	4.33	4.15	4.80
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258		4.54	4.38	4.18	5.00
		hniques succe		a open arroarren	8	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67			3.89	4.03	3.89	4.67
		_											,					
1 170		Semina		announced theme	1.0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 89	****	4 60	4 40	4.31	****
	_	_		ividual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92		4.62 4.67	4.49 4.54	4.16	****
					16 16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 90		4.49	4.54	4.10	****
		sjects contrib s contribute		what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 90		4.49	4.38	4.21	****
_				you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 93		4.39			****
5. Were Ci	riceria io	or grading mad	e clear		1/	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/ 93		4.03	4.06	3.92	
		Self																
				what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
		ons make clea		_	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were yo	our contac	ts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
			Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00 07	 5	0 00 0 00	1	n 10														1
00-27	-	0.00-0.99	1 0	A 10 B 8		ке	quire	ea i	or Ma	Jor	s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 56-83	1 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	C 0		C c ·	nera	1			1	.3	IIndox	mad 1	0	More	ma i a	17
84-150	0		0	D 0		Gei	iera.	T			Т	. 3	Under-g	rau l	.8	non-	-major	17
	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2	D 0 F 0		m1.	0 a t i -					٥	щини	Moor- +	hore -			.h
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						ectiv	ves				0	#### - waanana				_	111
				P 0 I 0		O+1	ner					0	respons	es to D	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
	? 0											U						
			r U															

University of Maryland Page 643
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 6

Composition

25

Sentell, James E

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

							ncie	· C		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
 Did you gain new 			0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	505/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.59
2. Did the instruct		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	378/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.65
Did the exam que		1 3	1	9	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	453/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.57
Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	503/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.47
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	193/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.71
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	140/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.76
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	lained	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	583/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.41
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	1098/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.47
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	750/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.14
1. Were the instruc	l prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	1086/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.24	
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 					0	0	1	16	4.94	322/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.94
3. Was lecture mate			0 1	0	0	0	0	10	- 6	4.38	768/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures	-		0	0	0	0	0	- 6	11	4.65	486/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual			1	1	0	3	4	5	3	3.53	969/1236		3.76	4.00	3.87	3.53
	-															
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		-	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	272/1260		4.21	4.14	3.95	4.71
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						4	0	10	4.43	647/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.43
3. Did the instruct	and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	468/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.71	
4. Were special tec	3	3	0	2	4	0	5	3.73	625/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.73		
	ıency	Dist	crib	ution	n											
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	;	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	 7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
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	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 7 University of Maryland Page 644 Title Composition MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Putzel,Diane Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

25

	Out of ing					equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor		Course	_		Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain new	v insights,skills fr	rom this course	0	0	1	1	6	8	5	3.71	1317/1	509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	922/1	509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the	expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	857/1	287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.14
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the ϵ	expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	715/1	459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.30
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to	what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	6	4	3.68	1093/1	406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	234/1	384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.65
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	lained	1	0	3	5	1	5	6	3.30	1367/1	489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.30
8. How many times w	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1222/1	506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.30
		aching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	523/1	463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.35
	Lecture																
1. Were the instruc	ctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	950/1	438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.38
	or seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	6		4.71			4.66	4.68	4.73		4.71
	erial presented and	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	10	4.33	,		4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.33
	contribute to what		0	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	/-		4.12	4.18	4.32		4.29
	techniques enhance		1	1	1	3	2	3	10	3.95	- ,		3.64		4.00		
	Discussion																
1. Did class discus		what wou learned	8	0	0	2	Λ	6	5	4.08	722/1	260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.08
	s actively encourage	_	8	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54			4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.54
	or encourage fair a		8	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	,		4.38	4.54		4.18	4.77
4. Were special ted		and open discussion	8	1	1	0	1	3	7	4.77				3.89	4.03	3.89	
4. Were special tec	miiques successiui		0	1		U	Т	3	,	4.25	333/	0/3	3.73	3.09	4.03	3.09	4.25
	Field Work																
1. Did field experi	lence contribute to	what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	***	****	4.39	3.75	***
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n										
Credits Earned	Cum GPA	Expected Grades				Pe:	ason	c c				Tvr	20			Maiors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 8
Title Composition

Instructor: Composition Bloom, Ryan I

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 645 MAR 22, 2010 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	2	1	7	8	2		1432/1509		4.05	4.31	4.18	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	636/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	2		****/1287		4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	6	7	4.00	979/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	776/1406		4.04	4.09	4.02	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	7	7	4.05	779/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	. ,	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	10		1146/1506		4.52	4.67	4.66	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	998/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	1166/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	846/1421		4.68	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56			4.24	4.31	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	12	4	4.18		4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	5	4	5	0		1168/1236		3.76	4.00	3.87	2.87
	_	-	_	_	_	_	-							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	12	5	4.17	681/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	443/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	261/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	427/ 873	3.73	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.06
- 1														
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	1 11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	***/ 198	***	* * * *	4.22	4.14	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work	1.0	_	_	^	1	^	0	2 00	****/ 40	****		4 20	2 75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****		4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	-	1	0	4.00	,		****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,		****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 8
Title Composition
Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 645 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	6	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 9
Title Composition

Title Composition
Instructor: Bloom, Ryan I

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 646 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Ins	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	0	0	0	2	8	4	4	3.56	1384/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	4	3.61	1326/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	9	2	3.65	1249/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	6	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.83	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	5	4.00	807/1384	4.21	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	4	5	3.44	1327/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	981/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	3	10	0	3.57	1217/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	617/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	863/1421	4.66	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1051/1411	4.22	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1245/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	3	3	6	1	3.21	1086/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	947/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	638/1255	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	784/1258	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	3	3	6	2	3.33	754/ 873		3.89	4.03	3.89	3.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	10	1	U	U	U	1	U	1.00	/ 103			7.10	4.13	
Seminar	1.0	1	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 00	****	4 60	4 40	4 21	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	•	0	0	0 2	Τ		****/ 89		4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	-	0	-	0	_	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 90 ****/ 92	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, , , ,		4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 9
Title Composition
Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
Enrollment: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 646 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	-		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 1 University of Maryland Title Composition Baltimore County Instructor: Brofman, Margare Fall 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

24

Page 647 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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	3	4	3	4	3.00	1473/1509	3.91	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	2	7	3.44	1391/1509	4.08	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1212/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.24	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1182/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	4	2	6	3.17	1307/1406	3.72	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	2	8	3.67	1107/1384	4.18	4.27	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	1193/1489	4.10	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.50	4.52	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	3	7	1	3.06	1385/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.06
Lecture	•		•	_	_	_		4 00			4 0 =			4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	3	3	9		1203/1438	4.21		4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	2	2	10		1345/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	5	1	6		1337/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.27	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	2	2	7		1317/1405	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	3	0	3	3	2 71	1216/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	3.95	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	2	1	3	5		1163/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	1	2	4	4		1180/1258	4.41	4.54	4.38	4.18	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	2	0	1			****/ 873		3.89	4.03	3.89	****
II Hold Special Committees Baccossia	-		Ü	_	Ū	_	_	3.23	, 0.5	3.00	3.07	1.05	5.07	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar			_	•		•								****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	***	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 90		4.49	4.50	4.21	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	U	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	Ο	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
1 Sometimes here for early out field desivities	_0	0	_	3	_	0	J		, 11			1.52		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 1 Title Composition Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Brofman, Margare Fall 2009 24

Page 647 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	 А	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 11 University of Maryland Composition Instructor:

Baltimore County Dunnigan, Brian Fall 2009

Page 648

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		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	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	327/1509	3.91	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	519/1509	4.08	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	739/1287		4.28	4.30	4.24	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	586/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	287/1406		4.04	4.09	4.02	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	14				4.27	4.11	3.98	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37		4.10	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	9	9		1188/1506		4.52	4.67	4.66	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	-		151/1463			4.07		4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	Т	2	13	4.75	151/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	775/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	828/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.79
•		0		0	1	8								
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0		0		_	-	10	4.47	653/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4		4.37	798/1405			4.32	4.27	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	3	3	4	8	3.94	730/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.94
_,														
Discussion	_					_			= 40 /4050	4 00				
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	543/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	519/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	337/1258	4.41	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	394/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
		_	-	-	-	_	_		,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred accivities	Τ/	Τ	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 44			4.32	4.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.32	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful									, -	****	****			****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	^ ~ ~ ~	^ ^ * *	4.27	4.21	^ ^ * *

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 11 Title Composition Instructor:

Dunnigan, Brian

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 648 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	10	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 649

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Composition Baltimore Instructor: Killgallon,Dona Fall

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 13

			Fre	eauer	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	598/1509	3.91	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	636/1509	4.08	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	519/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	346/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	423/1406	3.72	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	269/1384	4.18	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	791/1489	4.10	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	4.50	4.52	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	853/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	930/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	979/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	689/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	540/1405	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	7	3	10	4.15	572/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	280/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	602/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	605/1258	4.41	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	377/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.18
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.62	4.49	4.16	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 90	****	4.67	4.54	4.10	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.49	4.38	4.21	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	U	U	_	U	U	U	2.00	/ 93		1.03	1.00	3.72	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
J. 214 Somerences help you carry out freda activities		3	5	_	5	5	J	2.00	, 11			1.52	1.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
3 2														

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 13
Title Composition
Instructor: Killgallon,Dona

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 649 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	0	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 17

Composition

26

Walters, April I

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Fall 2009

Page 650

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies		s		Tns	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	^	0	2	2	_	-	2	2 10	1450/1500	2 01	4 05	4 21	4 10	2 10
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3 1	3 1	6 5	8	3 7		1458/1509		4.05	4.31	4.18	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	_	_	-	-			1189/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17 2	0 1	1 1	2 8	1 7	1		****/1287 1314/1459		4.28	4.30	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	3	8	2	3		1314/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	2.65
-		1	1	2	3	10	5						3.98	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	4	7			1043/1384 1267/1489		4.27	4.11 4.17	4.20	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	15	6 5		1300/1506		4.52	4.17	4.20	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	3	10	2		1181/1463		4.00	4.07	4.02	3.65
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-1				3	10	2	3.05	1101/1403	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	981/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	1084/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	1005/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1154/1405	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	5	5	4	3.39	1038/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	4	7	2 52	1038/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	3.95	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	6	6	4		1135/1255		4.40	4.33	4.15	3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37			4.54	4.38	4.18	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	2	6	5	0	2.93	- ,		3.89	4.03	3.89	2.93
4. Were special techniques successful	,	-	2	2	U	J	U	2.93	024/ 0/3	3.00	3.05	1.05	3.05	2.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,		4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 90		4.49	4.50	4.10	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	,		4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 93		4.03	4.06	3.92	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	U	U	U	1	1	1	4.00	/).		4.03	4.00	3.92	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41		****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,		****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37		****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30		****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Here differ changin proceeds for all the betaches			0	0	0	0	_	3.00	, 50			1.2/	1.21	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 17 Title Composition

Instructor: Walters, April I

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Page 650 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	Α	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	13	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 21

Title Composition

Instructor: Ray, Jennie B.

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 651 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	901/1509	3.91	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	519/1509	4.08	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	293/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	346/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	0	9	7	3.95	885/1406	3.72	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	269/1384	4.18	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	458/1489	4.10	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	883/1506	4.50	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	799/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	737/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	979/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	496/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	473/1405	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	853/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	201/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	547/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.41	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	366/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	0.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.30	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 21
Title Composition
Instructor: Ray,Jennie B.

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 651 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 25

Composition

27

Walters, April I

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Page 652 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	-ane	ncie	s		Tns	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	2	2	_	_	2	2 25	1447/1500	2 01	4 05	4 21	4 10	2 25
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3 1	3	6 6	9 8	3 5		1447/1509		4.05	4.31	4.18	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	_	4	-	-	-		1372/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	1	2	1	2		1215/1287		4.28	4.30	4.24	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	7	8		1177/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	12	3	3		1333/1406		4.04	4.09	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	7	8	6		1154/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	6	6	6		1350/1489		3.90	4.17	4.20	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	13	7		1330/1506		4.52	4.67	4.66	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	2	5	8	1	3.22	1347/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	7	7	6	3.73	1326/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.44	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	7	12		1269/1421		4.68	4.73	4.66	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	7	7	4		1272/1411		4.24	4.31	4.27	3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	9	5		1200/1405		4.18	4.32	4.27	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	3	5	5	8		799/1236		3.76	4.00		3.86
5. Did didiovisual ecciniques ciniance your understanding		_	O	5	5	3	O	3.00	755/1250	3.00	3.70	1.00	3.07	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	5	6	3	6		1045/1260		4.21	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	8	4	5		1127/1255		4.40	4.33	4.15	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	. ,		4.54	4.38	4.18	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	2	7	6	3	3.42	731/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	1	0	1	1	3 67	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 184		****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 177		****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 165		****	4.18	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specifica	21	_	O	O	O	O	2	3.00	, 103			1.10	1.13	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89		4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	,		4.49	4.50	4.21	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00			4.39	4.38	4.21	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33			****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	, -		****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	,		****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00			****	4.32	4.12	****
5. Dia conferences neip you early out field activities	21	J	Ü	J	_	_	_	1.00	, 11			1.52	1.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 49		****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50			****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37		****	4.05	4.47	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 25

Title Composition Baltimore Co
Instructor: Walters, April I Fall 20

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 652

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 653 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	26				
Questionnaires:	15	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 29

Composition

Pekarske, Nicole

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

2

F

P

Ι

0

0

0

1

Instructor:

			Fre	-anei	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1010/1509	3.91	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	4		1140/1509	4.08	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1066/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.11	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.72	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	773/1384	4.18	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	823/1489	4.10	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1287/1506	4.50	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	853/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	1343/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	1206/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1157/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.27	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1163/1405	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	666/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	904/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.41	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	610/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	3.89	3.75
Freq	ienas	, Diet	-rih	1+ i 01	n									
riequ	lency	DIS		1610	.1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 5	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 5		Gei	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0														

Electives

Other

0

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Page 654
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 33

Composition

24

Sentell, James E

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

Quoboronno				Bouadire coo				,,, Ç.				•						
							Fre	mier	ncies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1228/1509	3.91	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	7	4.06	1049/1509	4.08	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.06
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	9	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	875/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.11
4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	432/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.53
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	776/1406	3.72	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.06
				o what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	531/1384	4.18	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.33
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	458/1489	4.10	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.50
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	883/1506	4.50	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.72
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	3	1	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	957/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.93
		Lectur		_				_		_								
		actor's lecture			1	0	1	1	2	3	10		1128/1438		4.27	4.46	4.44	4.18
		ctor seem inter			1	0	1	0	0		12		1146/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.53
				xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	0			4.53	592/1411		4.24	4.31	4.27	4.53
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	5			4.35	,				4.27	4.35
5. Did auc	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	2	1	0	5	6	2	3.57	950/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.57
		Discus	aion															
1 Did ala	oga diga			what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.06	725/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.06
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	2	7	7		740/1255		4.40	4.33	4.15	4.31
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	493/1258		4.54	4.38	4.15	4.69
		echniques succe		a open discussion	2	1	1	0	4	<i>5</i>	4	3.80	585/ 873		3.89	4.03	3.89	3.80
4. Were b	peciai te	sciniiques succe	BBLUI		2	_	_	U	-	U	-	3.00	303/ 073	3.00	3.05	1.03	3.05	3.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	_	f the material	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pes	sons				Туј	ne			Majors	
										, 				pc 				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 8														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	neral	L			1	.3	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					0						

? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 655

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

26 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 5

Composition

Kidd, Kathleen A

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Fre	-anei	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	0	2	1	_	0	4 22	011/1500	2 01	4 05	1 21	1 10	4 22
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1 1	0	0	2 1	1 1	6 6	9 10	4.22	911/1509 720/1509	3.91 4.08	4.05 4.13	4.31	4.18 4.25	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	2	6	10	4.39	924/1287	4.08	4.13		4.25	4.39
			0	0	0							4.30		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1 1	1	1	3	8 2	9	4.53	432/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.53 4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1						10	4.12	729/1406		4.04	4.09	4.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	3	13	4.39	466/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	583/1489	4.10	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	1	9	6		1340/1506		4.52	4.67	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	381/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	839/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	742/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	2	13	4.53	592/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	14	4.63	513/1405	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	421/1236		3.76	4.00	3.87	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	487/1260		4.21	4.14	3.95	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	390/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	468/1258	4.41	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	250/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports ofearly specified	10	J	Ü	Ü	_	o	Ü	3.00	, 103			1.10	1.13	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you early out field detivities	10	Ü	_	O	U	O	O	1.00	, 11			1.52	1.12	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 5 University of Maryland Composition Baltimore County Instructor: Fall 2009

Kidd, Kathleen A

Page 655 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	1	-			
				?	0						

Title

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 19

Course-Section: ENGL 100H 1 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County Composition - Honors Instructor: McCarthy, Lucill Fall 2009

0

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 656

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did 1101	. aain na	Genera w insights,ski	_	, this source	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1509	4.92	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.92
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1509	4.92	4.13	4.26	4.10	4.92
					0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.92	359/1287	4.92	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.92
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.67	96/1459	4.67	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.67
		ations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.25	587/1406	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.25
	-	-		what you learned	0	-	0	0	0	0	11		,					
		_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	•	11	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.27	4.11	3.98	5.00
	-	was class canc			-	-	•	0	•	5	10		1006/1506		4.52	4.67	4.66	4.58
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overa	II teac	ning effectiveness	0	1	0	U	0	Τ	10	4.91	81/1463	4.91	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.91
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well :	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.83
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.92
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.83
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.83
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar				0	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/1236		3.76	4.00	3.87	****
5. 21a aa	a_0 v_D aa_	. ocomingaco cin	ilanoc 7		Ū		Ü	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	_	5.00	, 1230		3.70	1.00	3.07	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.21	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.54	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	3.89	4.03	3.89	5.00
	_	-																
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	sons	3			Туј	рe			Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 10					or Ma			6	Graduat		 0	Majo		
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1 0	A 10 B 2		ке	quir	eu I	DT M9	: JUE	Ö	U	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	В 2 С 0		Ce	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	L2	Non-	major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		00	c.a.	•				•	onaci -g.	Luu I		14011		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		E.T	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	,	P 0			2001					-	respons				_	
				I 0		0+	her					0	I CDPOIID		o bigi			
				± 0		00						-						

Course-Section: ENGL 100P 1 University of Maryland Baltimore County Composition

Title

Instructor: Ray, Jennie B. Fall 2009 Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	953/1509	9 4.19	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.19
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	652/1509	9 4.44	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.44
		estions reflec			1	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	708/128		4.28	4.30	4.24	4.33
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	705/1459		4.22	4.22	4.11	4.31
				what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	3	6		1155/140		4.04	4.09	4.02	3.56
		_		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	327/138		4.27	4.11	3.98	4.53
	_	g system clearl		ained	0	0	1	1	3	5	6		1127/1489		3.90	4.17	4.20	3.88
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/150		4.52	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	628/1463	3 4.25	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	981/1438	3 4.36	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.36
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	In the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1107/142	1 4.57	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.57
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	617/1413	1 4.50	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.50
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	733/140	5 4.43	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.43
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	6	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1072/1236	3.29	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.29
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cla	ass discu	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.50		
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	367/125		4.40	4.33	4.15	4.73
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	549/1258		4.54	4.38	4.18	4.60
		echniques succe			1	3	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	383/ 873		3.89	4.03	3.89	4.17
		Field	Worls															
1 Did fi	eld evner			what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4.00	****/ 48	2 ****	****	4.39	3.75	****
				luation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	/ 1	-	****	4.41	4.29	****
-	-	ctor available			15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	-	****	4.51	4.53	****
		could you disc			15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -		****	4.18	4.26	****
	_	-	_	ield activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4	4 ****	****	4.32	4.12	***
				Frequ	ency	. Dist	trib	ıt i oı	1									
				_	iciic j	DID	CI ID	uc101	-									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				T	ype			Majors	3
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 11		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s 1	4	Graduat	 :e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_			-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-	grad 1	L6	Non-	major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	ses to b	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
				Ι 0		Otl	ner					0						
				? 0														

Page 657

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 1

Title Composition

Instructor: Mabe, Mitzi

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 658 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	4	8	9	1	3.04	1472/1509	3.57	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	9	6	1		1492/1509	3.82	4.13	4.26	4.25	2.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	3	1	0		****/1287	3.75	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	4	6	4	3		1422/1459	3.91	4.22	4.22	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	5	8	3	0	2.25	1398/1406	3.31	4.04	4.09	4.02	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	7	8	2	3.13	1309/1384	3.96	4.27	4.11	3.98	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	9	8	2	2	1	2.00	1481/1489	3.63	3.90	4.17	4.20	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	466/1506	4.40	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	2	9	4	1	3.00	1392/1463	3.75	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	8	3	4	6	3	2.71	1424/1438	4.09	4.27	4.46	4.44	2.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	5	8	3	1	2.48	1396/1411	3.90	4.24	4.31	4.27	2.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	7	6	1	2.71	1379/1405	3.95	4.18	4.32	4.27	2.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	6	9	3	2	2.71	1185/1236	3.57	3.76	4.00	3.87	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	2	6	4	4	3.10	1148/1260	3.58	4.21	4.14	3.95	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	1	8	8	4.00	904/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	932/1258	4.32	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	6	0	5	3	2	2.69	848/ 873	3.46	3.89	4.03	3.89	2.69
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/ 89	4.00	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 92	4.33	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	2	0	1	2		****/ 90	4.17	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	2	1	1		****/ 92		4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 93	4.17	4.03	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	2	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	2	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 1
Title Composition
Instructor: Mabe, Mitzi
Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 658 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	16	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	2						

University of Maryland

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 3 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Title Composition Hickernell, Mary Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17

Page 659 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		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	1	1	7	4	4	3.53	1393/1509	3.57	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1215/1509	3.82	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	3.75	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	938/1459	3.91	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	4	5	3.41	1231/1406	3.31	4.04	4.09	4.02	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	886/1384	3.96	4.27	4.11	3.98	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	2	3			1315/1489	3.63	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	14			1422/1506	4.40	4.52	4.67	4.66	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	5	1	3.58	1213/1463	3.75	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.58
T a shows a														
Lecture	0	0	1	^	2	_	-	1 00	1100/1420	4 00	4 07	1 16	1 11	1 06
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	6	7		1188/1438	4.09	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	9		1246/1421	4.67	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	7			1107/1411	3.90	4.24	4.31	4.27	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	7		1098/1405	3.95	4.18	4.32	4.27	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	984/1236	3.57	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	930/1260	3.58	4.21	4.14	3.95	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	4	4		1050/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	829/1258	4.32	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	3	4		3.89	545/ 873		3.89	4.03	3.89	3.89
i. Here special techniques successful	3	3	Ü	Ü	3	-	_	3.03	3137 073	3.10	3.05	1.05	3.05	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	4.00	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	4.33	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	4.17	4.49	4.50	4.21	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	4.17	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	4.17	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
mini di mania														
Field Work	1.0	0	0	^	^	0	-1	F 00	4444 / 40	****		4 20	2 75	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48		****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
o. Horo chore chough proceeds for all the beautiful		U	5	5	9	0	_	5.00	, 50			1.41		

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 3 University of Maryland Title Composition Baltimore County Instructor: Hickernell, Mary Fall 2009

University of Maryland Page 659
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
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	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 5 University of Maryland Page 660 Title Composition MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Walters, April I Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	23	
Questionnaires:	12	

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 4 3 4 3.83 1265/1509 3.57 4.05 4.31 4.18 3.83 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 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Dought and the grading system clearly explained 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Were 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 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 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 5. Did to 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 5 4.08 1027/1509 3.82 4.13 4.26 4.25 4.08 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 1 3 0 3.75 1091/1287 3.75 4.28 4.30 4.24 3.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 2 6 4 4.27 748/1459 3.91 4.22 4.22 4.11 4.27 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 2 6 1 3.33 1258/1406 3.31 4.04 4.09 4.02 3.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 6 4 4.27 599/1384 3.96 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 1 1 5 5 5 4.17 854/1489 3.63 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.17 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 845/1506 4.40 4.52 4.67 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 983/1463 3.75 4.00 4.09 4.02 3.79 0.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. O 1 2 2 6 1 3.33 1258/1406 3.31 4.04 4.09 4.02 3.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 854/1489 3.63 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. The current of the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.49 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 9. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 9. Did the instructor recovery and the following following the propert of the following fo
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. O 1 2 2 6 1 3.33 1258/1406 3.31 4.04 4.09 4.02 3.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 854/1489 3.63 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. The current of the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. O 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.49 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 9. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 9. Did the instructor recovers the water of the subject of the properties of the subject of the properties of the subject of the properties of the subject of th
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 2 6 6 1 3.33 1258/1406 3.31 4.04 4.09 4.02 3.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 6 4 4.27 599/1384 3.96 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 5 4.17 854/1409 3.63 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.17 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 5 2 3.90 983/1463 3.75 4.00 4.09 4.02 3.90 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 983/1463 3.75 4.00 4.09 4.02 3.90 Incomplete the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.58 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 6 4 4.17 957/1411 3.90 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.1
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 6 4 4.27 599/1384 3.96 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 854/1489 3.63 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.17 9.00 4.17 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 6 4 4.27 599/1384 3.96 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 854/1489 3.63 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.17 9. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 854/1489 3.63 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 983/1463 3.75 4.00 4.09 4.02 3.90 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 983/1463 3.75 4.00 4.09 4.02 3.90 9. Was the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.74 4.58 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.74 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 845/1506 4.40 4.52 4.67 4.66 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 5 2 3.90 983/1463 3.75 4.00 4.09 4.02 3.90 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 957/1411 3.90 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion Discussion Discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 ****
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 957/1411 3.90 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 957/1411 3.90 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 700/1438 4.09 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 957/1411 3.90 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 1014/1421 4.67 4.68 4.73 4.66 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 957/1411 3.90 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 6 4 4.17 957/1411 3.90 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 5 5 4.17 960/1405 3.95 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 6 4.50 274/1236 3.57 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 0 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 888/1260 3.58 4.21 4.14 3.95 3.86 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 526/1255 4.11 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.57 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 468/1258 4.32 4.54 4.38 4.18 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/198 **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 2 2 1 3.80 585/873 3.46 3.89 4.03 3.89 3.80 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.22 4.14 **** Seminar
Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 2 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 67/89 4.00 4.62 4.49 4.31 4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 65/ 92 4.33 4.67 4.54 4.16 4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 65/ 90 4.17 4.49 4.50 4.21 4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 65/ 92 4.17 4.39 4.38 4.21 4.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 50/ 93 4.17 4.03 4.06 3.92 4.17
Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 3.75 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.41 4.29 ****
Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.26 4.28 ****
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 5 0.00-0.99 1 A 6 Required for Majors 5 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 5 Under-grad 12 Non-major 10
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 significant
I 0 Other 0

? 0

University of Maryland

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 7 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Title Composition Pekarske, Nicole Instructor: Enrollment: 8

Page 661 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	8	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberennari eb	5	Doddono	000100	2.02002011	Queberennarre

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1236/1509	3.57	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1509	3.82	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1287	3.75	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	737/1459	3.91	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	587/1406	3.31	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	349/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	109/1489	3.63	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.40	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	325/1463	3.75	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.09	4.27	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.67	4.68	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	3.90	4.24	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	3.95	4.18	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1260	3.58	4.21	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	4.11	4.40	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	4.32	4.54	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.46	3.89	4.03	3.89	****
1. Here opecial techniques successivi														
Frequ			trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	5	Α	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 110 1

Composition ESL Studen

Instructor: Taylor, Paul

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 15

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 662 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anner	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	^	0	0	0	_	1.0	1 67	410/1500	4 40	4 05	4 21	4 10	1 67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5 3	10	4.67	410/1509	4.49	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			U	0		2	12	4.80	201/1509	4.71	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0		1 1		12	4.73	282/1287	4.57	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.60	346/1459	4.59	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0		-				12	4.80	135/1406	4.65	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1		4.60	278/1384		4.27	4.11	3.98	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.73	208/1489	4.65	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0 1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	807/1506	4.79	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	Τ	U	U	U	4	8	4.67	209/1463	4.49	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	396/1438	4.75	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.86	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	267/1411	4.74	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	486/1405	4.51	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	0	1	8	4.08	625/1236	3.94	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	109/1260	4.66	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	254/1255	4.72	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/1258	4.72	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	- ,			4.03	3.89	4.54
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	2		, -	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
									•					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENGL 110 1

Title Composition ESL Studen

Instructor: Taylor, Paul

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 662 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	d Grades Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required	d for Majors 8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Elective	es 1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P 0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I 0	Other	0	-			
				? 0						

Course-Section: ENGL 110 5 University of Maryland Page 663 Title Composition ESL Studen Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Taylor,Paul

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.31	833/1509	4.49	4.05	4.31	4.18	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	4.62	412/1509	4.49	4.13	4.26	4.16	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.62	626/1287	4.71	4.13	4.20	4.25	4.62
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0	0	1	0	3	10	4.42	378/1459	4.57	4.28	4.30	4.24	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	•	•	_	•	3			,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	332/1406	4.65	4.04	4.09	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	349/1384	4.55	4.27	4.11	3.98	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	376/1489	4.65	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	807/1506	4.79	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	579/1463	4.49	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	514/1438	4.75	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	828/1421	4.86	4.68	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	376/1411	4.74	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	778/1405	4.51	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	824/1236	3.94	3.76	4.00	3.87	3.80
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	505/1260	4.66	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	505/1255	4.72	4.40	4.33	4.15	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	549/1258	4.72	4.54	4.38	4.18	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	366/ 873	4.37	3.89	4.03	3.89	4.20
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 1 University of Maryland Title Introduction To Lit

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 664

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry	Fall 2009
Enrollment:	44	
Questionnaires:	33	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncie	s			tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u dain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	2	2	7	13	9	3 76	1304/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.34	3.76
		tor make clear			0	0	0	3	8	12	10		1183/1509	3.88	4.13	4.26	4.32	3.88
		estions reflec	_		0	0	0	2	8	10	13	4.03	911/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.03
	_	ations reflect		1 3	0	3	0	3	12	8	7		1254/1459	3.63	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.63
			_	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	287/1406	4.58	4.04	4.09	4.09	4.58
	_	-		what you learned	0	2	2	1	12	7	9	3.65	1120/1384	3.65	4.27	4.11	4.09	3.65
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ned	0	0	2	5	10	9	7	3.42	1335/1489	3.42	3.90	4.17	4.19	3.42
8. How man	ny times v	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	30	3	4.09	1349/1506	4.09	4.52	4.67	4.61	4.09
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	11	11	5	3.78	1084/1463	3.78	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.78
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	_	repared	0	0	1	1	5	8	18	4.24	1078/1438	4.24	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.24
		tor seem inter	_	-	0	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	933/1421	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.73
				plained clearly	0	0	1	0	6	12	14	4.15	964/1411	4.15	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.15
		s contribute t			0	0	2	2	2	10	17	4.15	967/1405		4.18	4.32	4.39	4.15
			_	our understanding	2	11	7	3	3	3	4		1185/1236		3.76	4.00		2.70
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al:	ace diecu			what you learned	15	0	1	0	5	8	4	3.78	924/1260	3.78	4.21	4.14	4.19	3.78
				to participate	15	0	2	1	3	7	5		1084/1255	3.67	4.40	4.33	4.37	3.67
				d open discussion	15	0	3	0	1	5	9	3.94	980/1258	3.94	4.54	4.38	4.44	3.94
		chniques succe		open arbeassion	15	4	2	2	4	4	2	3.14	787/ 873			4.03	4.04	
2 Were vo	ou provid	Labora ed with adequa	-	ground information	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Z. Were yo	ou provid	ca with aacqua	cc backs	jiodila illioillacioli	52	O	Ü	U	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 100			1.22	1.51	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	ре			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	 quire	ed f	or M	ajor	 s 1	.4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			_			,						3 -		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Ger	neral	L				9	Under-g	rad 3	3	Non-	major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1					h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1						

? 1

Course-Section: ENGL 226 1 University of Maryland Title

English Grammar Usage

Instructor: Harris,Linda R

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 23 Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 665 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

		Executoraios

	Out of the court		.	272	Fre	_	ncies	5	_		tructo			Dept			
	Questions		NR	NA		2	3	. <u>4</u>	5	Mean	Raı	nk 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain new		m this course	0	0	2	4	7	5	5	3.30	1440/	1509	3.30	4.05	4.31	4.34	3.30
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	6	7	3	7	3.48	1381/	1509	3.48	4.13	4.26	4.32	3.48
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the e	expected goals	1	0	1	1	9	3	8	3.73	1101/	1287	3.73	4.28	4.30	4.35	3.73
4. Did other evaluat	tions reflect the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	3	8	4	6	3.50	1314/	1459	3.50	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.50
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	1	3	2	3	5	6	3	3.26	1279/	1406	3.26	4.04	4.09	4.09	3.26
6. Did written assig	gnments contribute t	o what you learned	0	1	2	6	5	4	5	3.18	1299/	1384	3.18	4.27	4.11	4.09	3.18
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expla	ined	0	0	2	4	6	4	7	3.43	1331/	1489	3.43	3.90	4.17	4.19	3.43
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	1	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	1243/	1506	4.27	4.52	4.67	4.61	4.27
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	6	0	3	0	7	5	2	3.18	1362/	1463	3.18	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.18
	Lecture																
1. Were the instruct	cor's lectures well	prepared	2	0	2	2	4	4	9	3.76	1311/	1438	3.76	4.27	4.46	4.48	3.76
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested i	n the subject	1	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	1217/	1421	4.41	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.41
3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and e	explained clearly	2	0	1	3	4	4	9	3.81	1187/	1411	3.81	4.24	4.31	4.37	3.81
4. Did the lectures			3	0	2	3	4	2	9	3.65	1223/	1405	3.65	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.65
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance y	our understanding	3	12	2	1	0	2	3	3.38	1042/	1236	3.38	3.76	4.00	4.11	3.38
	Discussion																
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1045/	1260	3.50	4.21	4.14	4.19	3.50
2. Were all students			17	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	839/	1255	4.17	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.17
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair an	d open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	932/	1258	4.00	4.54	4.38	4.44	4.00
4. Were special tech	nniques successful		17	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	873	***	3.89	4.03	4.04	***
	Laboratory																
1. Did the lab incre			21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided			21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary ma			21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/		****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instr	_		21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/		****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements	s for lab reports cl	early specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
	Seminar																
1. Were assigned top	pics relevant to the	announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	89	****	4.62	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructo	or available for ind	lividual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
4. Did presentations	s contribute to what	you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	92	****	4.39	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for	grading made clear		22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	23	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Currents In British Li

Instructor: Fernandez, Jean

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 666

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	g		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	911/1509	4.23	4.05	4.31	4.34	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	932/1509	4.18	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	536/1459	4.45	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	246/1406	4.64	4.04	4.09	4.09	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	394/1384	4.45	4.27	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	641/1489	4.36	3.90	4.17	4.19	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1305/1506	4.18	4.52	4.67	4.61	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture		_			_									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	712/1438	4.57	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	2	13	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	568/1405	4.57	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	****/1236	****	3.76	4.00	4.11	****
Planada														
Discussion	_	0	^	^	^	1	1.0	4 0 4	00/1060	4 0 4	4 01	1 1 1	4 10	4 0 4
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	Τ	16	4.94	82/1260	4.94	4.21	4.14	4.19	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	Τ	0	2	3	11	4.35	707/1255	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3		13	4.59	563/1258	4.59	4.54	4.38	4.44	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	U	Τ	2	8	3	3.93	517/ 873	3.93	3.89	4.03	4.04	3.93

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	-	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 243 1 University of Maryland Title Currents In American L

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 667

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	9	10	3.97	1154/1509	4.23	4.05	4.31	4.34	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	912/1509	4.33	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	8	13	4.07	898/1287	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	11	4.10	911/1459	4.27	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	22	4.66	231/1406	4.74	4.04	4.09	4.09	4.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	557/1384	4.31	4.27	4.11	4.09	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	7	13	3.93	1070/1489	4.21	3.90	4.17	4.19	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.52	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	9	10	5	3.72	1125/1463	4.06	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	3	19	4.39	940/1438	4.43	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	429/1421	4.95	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	9	13	4.18	950/1411	4.39	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	19	4.46	683/1405	4.55	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	5	1	0	0	2	2.13	1217/1236	3.11	3.76	4.00	4.11	2.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	Λ	3	2	18	4.63	337/1260	4.49	4.21	4.14	4.19	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	656/1255	4.30	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	421/1258	4.77	4.54	4.38	4.44	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	8	1	5	0	4	2.50	853/ 873		3.89	4.03	4.04	2.50
1. Note opecial committees successful	O	5	5	_	5	U	_	2.50	000/ 0/0	2.50	3.05	1.05	1.01	2.50

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	29	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 243 2

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Currents In American L

Title Instructor: Blumberg, Arnold

50

Fall 2009

Page 668 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	g		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	10	21	4.48	623/1509	4.23	4.05	4.31	4.34	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	19	4.45	621/1509	4.33	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	9	18	4.50	519/1287	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	13	17	4.44	569/1459	4.27	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82			4.04	4.09	4.09	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	6	20	4.31	557/1384		4.27	4.11	4.09	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	9	21	4.48	485/1489	4.21	3.90	4.17	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	30	3		1349/1506		4.52	4.67	4.61	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	13	13	4.39	478/1463	4.06	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	14	15	4.47	852/1438	4.43	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	215/1421	4.95	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	12	18	4.60	496/1411	4.39	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	499/1405		4.18	4.32	4.39	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	620/1236		3.76	4.00	4.11	4.10
Discussion	1.0	0	•	•		_	1.0	4 25	FF1 /1060	4 40	4 01	4 1 4	4 10	4 25
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	551/1260	4.49	4.21	4.14	4.19	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	4	3	14	4.17	834/1255		4.40	4.33	4.37	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	386/1258	4.77	4.54	4.38	4.44	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	10	16	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	****/ 873	2.50	3.89	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	0	0			****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work	2.0	0	•	•	-	•	_	2 00		als als als als	ate ate ate ate	4 20	4 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48			4.41	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 243 2

Currents In American L

Instructor: Blumberg, Arnold

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 33

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 668 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	17	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	33	Non-major	32
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 1 University of Maryland Title Intro To Shakespeare Baltimore County Instructor: Farabaugh, Robin Fall 2009

Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 669

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	34	
Questionnaires:	24	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				eque					tructor	Course	DOPO	00	Level	Sect
		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	2	11	8	3.88	1236/1509	3.88	4.05	4.31	4.34	3.8
. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	8	11	4.04	1056/1509	4.04	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.0
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	626/1287	4.42	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.4
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	11	6	3.83	1143/1459	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.8
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	231/1406	4.65	4.04	4.09	4.09	4.6
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	ed 1	0	0	2	4	9	8	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.09	4.0
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	5	10	3.92	1094/1489	3.92	3.90	4.17	4.19	3.9
. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	15	7	4.21	1295/1506	4.21	4.52	4.67	4.61	4.2
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ss 3	1	1	0	3	11	5	3.95	918/1463	3.95	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.9
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	917/1438	4.42	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.4
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0		20	4.83			4.68		4.76	4.8
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	725/1411		4.24		4.37	4.4
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2				828/1405					4.3
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	, 1	5	4	3	7				1177/1236					2.7
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	725/1260	4.06	4.21	4.14	4.19	4.0
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	12				4.40		4.37	4.6
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 7	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	710/1258		4.54		4.44	4.4
. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	4	1	6	3.77					4.04	3.7
Fre	quency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	es			Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	13		_	1		'	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	6	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	1					_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 271 1 University of Maryland Page 670 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Intro Creat Wrtg-Ficti

Instructor: Shivnan, Sally A

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course O 0 0 0 2 4 14 4.60 482/1509 4.60 4.05 4.31 4.34 4.60	Questions				NR	NA	Fr	-	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2 4 14 4.60 482/1509 4.60 4.05 4.31 4.34 4.60 2.0 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 293/1287 4.73 4.28 4.30 4.35 4.76 3.0 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 293/1287 4.73 4.28 4.30 4.35 4.76 3.0 Did the exam guestions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 293/1287 4.73 4.28 4.30 4.35 4.76 3.0 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 3 14 4.50 332/1405 4.50 4.22 4.22 4.30 4.50 5.0 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 199/1384 4.70 4.27 4.11 4.09 4.70 7.0 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 199/1384 4.70 4.27 4.11 4.09 4.70 7.0 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9.0 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 3 9 4.00 467/1463 4.40 4.00 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 9.00 4.09 4.00 4.09 4.00 4.09 4.00 4.00																			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 8 12 4.60 424/1509 4.60 4.13 4.26 4.32 4.60 3 bid the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 293/1287 4.73 4.28 4.30 4.35 4.60 3 bid other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 15 4.60 346/1459 4.60 4.22 4.22 4.30 4.56 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 14 4.50 332/1406 4.50 4.04 4.09 4.09 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 199/1384 4.70 4.27 4.11 4.09 4.70 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 6 4 10 4.20 823/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1405 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.40 467/1463 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.40 467/1463 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 1 4 4.11 4.47 839/1438 4.47 4.27 4.46 4.48 4.47 4.50 4.40 4.40 4.40 4.40 4.40 4.40 4.40			Genera	.1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 1 1 9 9 4.73 293/1287 4.73 4.28 4.30 4.35 4.73 4.70 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 3 3 15 4.60 346/1459 4.60 4.22 4.22 4.30 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 14 4.50 332/1406 4.50 4.04 4.09 4.09 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 199/1384 4.70 4.27 4.11 4.09 4.70 4.70 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.11 4.47 839/1438 4.47 4.70 4.09 4.08 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70	_	_	J ,			0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	482/1509				4.34	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 15 4.60 346/1459 4.60 4.22 4.22 4.30 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 6 4 10 4.20 823/1406 4.50 4.04 4.09 4.70 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. O 0 1 1 4 11 4.47 839/1438 4.47 4.27 4.46 4.48 4.47 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. O 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.88 588/1421 4.88 4.68 4.73 4.76 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. O 0 1 0 1 1 4 4.69 486/1405 4.65 4.18 4.32 4.39 4.65 8. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. O 0 1 0 1 1 4.69 486/1405 4.65 4.18 4.32 4.39 4.65 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7. O 0 0 1 1 1 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 7. O 0 1 0 7 4.10 417/873 4.10 3.89 4.03 4.04 8. Were special techniques successful 1. Frequency Distribution 1. Frequency Distribution 1. The contribute to what you learned 1. Common GPA Expected Grades 1. Reasons 2. Graduate 3. Under-grad 3. Under-grad 3. Under-grad 3. Under-grad 4. O Non-major 5. Graduate 8. O Non-major 9. D Non-major 1. Reasons 1. Reasons 1. Reasons 1. Reasons 2. Graduate 3. Under-grad 4. O Non-major 1. Reasons 2. Reasons 3. Under-grad 4. O Non-major 5. Reasons 1. Reasons 2. Reasons 3. Under-grad 4. O Non-major 5. Reasons 4. Reasons 5. O Non-					1 0	0		-	0	0	8	12	4.60	424/1509	4.60		4.26	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 3 14 4.50 332/1406 4.50 4.04 4.09 4.09 4.09 6.00 6 bid written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 199/1384 4.70 4.27 4.11 4.09 4.70 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 4 10 4.20 823/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.07 4.01 4.09 4.70 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.04 667/1463 4.00 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.04 667/1463 4.00 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.49 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.04 667/1463 4.00 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.09 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.07 4.01 4.08 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.05 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.07 4.01 4.08 4.07 4.01 4.08 4.07 4.01 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00						0		-	-	1	1	9		,				4.35	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 2 16 4.70 199/1384 4.70 4.27 4.11 4.09 4.70 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 6 4 10 4.20 823/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 6 4 10 4.20 823/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.40 467/1463 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00						0		-		1		15						4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 6 4 10 4.20 823/1489 4.20 3.90 4.17 4.19 4.20 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 9 4.40 467/1463 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 1 4 4 11 4.47 839/1438 4.47 4.27 4.46 4.48 4.47 2.00 1.00 1.00 1 1 1 4.88 4.68 4.73 4.76 4.88 4.68 4.73 4.76 4.88 4.68 4.73 4.76 4.88 4.69 4.79 4.70 4.89 4.00 4.01 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70		-	-		_	0	-	•	_	2	_	14						4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 17 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 7 4.85 682/1506 4.85 4.52 4.67 4.61 4.85 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 3 3 7 9 4.40 467/1463 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.09 4.08 4.40 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	-		2	16	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.27	4.11	4.09	4.70
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5	7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	6	4	10	4.20	823/1489	4.20	3.90	4.17	4.19	4.20
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.47 839/1438 4.47 4.27 4.46 4.48 4.47 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 588/1421 4.88 4.68 4.73 4.76 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 303/1411 4.75 4.24 4.31 4.37 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 4.66 4.65 4.18 4.32 4.39 4.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3. 9 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 383/1236 4.38 3.76 4.00 4.11 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7. 0 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7. 0 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.51 4.38 4.34 4.37 4.77 4.40 4.33 4.37 4.77 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7. 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	•	0	3	17	4.85	682/1506	4.85	4.52	4.67	4.61	4.85
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.47 839/1438 4.47 4.27 4.46 4.48 4.47 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 588/1421 4.88 4.68 4.73 4.76 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 303/1411 4.75 4.24 4.31 4.37 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 486/1405 4.65 4.18 4.32 4.39 4.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 9 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 383/1236 4.38 3.76 4.00 4.11 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 588/1421 4.88 4.68 4.73 4.76 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 303/1411 4.75 4.24 4.31 4.37 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 9 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 383/1236 4.38 3.76 4.00 4.11 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.77 333/1255 4.77 4.40 4.33 4.37 4.77 3 1 1 1 0 7 4.10 417/873 4.10 3.89 4.03 4.04 4.10 Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 Cher 4																			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 303/1411 4.75 4.24 4.31 4.37 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 486/1405 4.65 4.18 4.32 4.39 4.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 9 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 383/1236 4.38 3.76 4.00 4.11 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 4.69 4.65 4.65 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.65 4.65						3	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	839/1438	4.47	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 486/1405 4.65 4.18 4.32 4.39 4.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 9 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 383/1236 4.38 3.76 4.00 4.11 4.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00					3	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.68		4.76	4.88
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 4.00 4.10 4.00 3.89 4.03 4.04 4.10 4.00 4.10 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.75	
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 1 11 4.77 333/1255 4.77 4.40 4.33 4.37 4.77 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 3 1 1 1 0 7 4.10 417/ 873 4.10 3.89 4.03 4.04 4.10 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4	4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	486/1405	4.65		4.32	4.39	4.65
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 287/1260 4.69 4.21 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 333/1255 4.77 4.40 4.33 4.37 4.77 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4. Were special techniques successful 7 3 1 1 1 0 7 4.10 417/873 4.10 3.89 4.03 4.04 4.10 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 55-6-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4	5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	9	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	383/1236	4.38	3.76	4.00	4.11	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 1 1 11 4.77 333/1255 4.77 4.40 4.33 4.37 4.77 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0																			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 1 0 1 11 4.69 486/1258 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.54 4.38 4.44 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69	1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	287/1260	4.69	4.21	4.14	4.19	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful 7 3 1 1 1 0 7 4.10 417/873 4.10 3.89 4.03 4.04 4.10 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4	2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	333/1255	4.77	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.77
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4	3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	486/1258	4.69	4.54	4.38	4.44	4.69
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4	4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		7	3	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	417/ 873	4.10	3.89	4.03	4.04	4.10
00-27					Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
28-55	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
28-55	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12						 Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		2	Graduat	 e	0	Maic	 or	5
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1 General 3 Under-grad 20 Non-major 15 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 0		1		0				<u>.</u> =			J								-
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4		2		3			Ge	nera	1				3	Under-a	rad 2	20	Non-	-major	15
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 10 #### - Means there are not enough P 1 I 0 Other 4				4	D 0									5				3	
P 1 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4							E1	ecti	ves			1	0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	: enouc	h
I 0 Other 4										_	-					_			
		- -				O+	her					4	10050110	-5 00 1					
						00						-							

Course-Section: ENGL 273 1 University of Maryland Title Int Creative Wtg-Poetr

Baltimore County

Instructor: McGurrin, Anthon

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 11

MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 671

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	E Valuation	Queberonnarie

	3						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1288/1509	3.80	4.05	4.31	4.34	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1372/1509	3.50	4.13	4.26	4.32	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1287	****	4.28	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	729/1406	4.11	4.04	4.09	4.09	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	939/1384	3.90	4.27	4.11	4.09	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	1463/1489	2.50	3.90	4.17	4.19	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1474/1506	3.70	4.52	4.67	4.61	3.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1217/1463	3.57	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1377/1438	3.44	4.27	4.46	4.48	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	1123/1421	4.56	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1220/1405	3.67	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	908/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.19	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1258		4.54	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	***	3.89	4.03	4.04	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_		
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 1 University of Maryland Page 672 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Intro Wrtg Creat Essay

Instructor: Benson,Linda K

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire 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	3	3	7	7	3.90	1214/1509	3.99	4.05	4.31	4.34	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	9	5		1228/1509	4.07	4.13	4.26	4.32	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	1	0	1	2		****/1287	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	10	7	4.21	814/1459	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	7	6	3.90	934/1406	3.75	4.04	4.09	4.09	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	299/1384	4.57	4.27	4.11	4.09	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	7	7	3	3.58	1275/1489	3.78	3.90	4.17	4.19	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	15	3	4.11	1346/1506	4.12	4.52	4.67	4.61	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1168/1463	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	5	8	4 11	1166/1438	4.12	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14		933/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	5	8		1025/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	4	6		1220/1405	3.85	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	0	0	0	1		****/1236		3.76	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
	1.0	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.40	505/1260	4.52	4.21	4.14	4.19	4 40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10 10	0	0	0	0	4 2	8	4.40	287/1255	4.52	4.40	4.14	4.19	4.40 4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.80	4.54	4.38	4.44	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.60	178/ 873	4.34	3.89	4.30	4.44	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	10	U	U	U	U	4	0	4.00	170/ 073	4.34	3.03	4.03	4.04	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 2 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Intro Wrtg Creat Essay Instructor: McGurrin, Anthon

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 13

Page 673 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ω	Ω	1	Λ	5	3	4	3 60	1325/1509	3.99	4.05	4.31	4.34	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	6		1202/1509	4.07	4.13	4.26	4.32	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	779/1287	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	1	5		1088/1459	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.30	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	2		1323/1406	3.75	4.22	4.09	4.09	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	<u>ک</u> ۸	1	7	4.25	619/1384	4.57	4.27	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	7	5		1193/1489	3.78	3.90	4.17	4.19	3.77
	0	0	0	2	∠ 5	3 4	2		1486/1506		4.52			3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	_	2	4			,			4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	Т	U	0	1	/	Τ	4.00	853/1463	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	0	5	3.64	1350/1438	4.12	4.27	4.46	4.48	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	1285/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1182/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.37	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	1317/1405	3.85	4.18	4.32	4.39	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	0	3		****/1236		3.76	4.00	4.11	****
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	621/1260	4.52	4.21	4.14	4.19	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	904/1255	4.60	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	620/1258	4.80	4.54	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	705/ 873	4.34	3.89	4.03	4.04	3.50

Credits Ea					l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	А	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 3

Intro Wrtg Creat Essay

Instructor: Sawyers, Seth A

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 17

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 674 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						1						ructor		_		Level		
		Question	S		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	756/1509	3.99	4.05	4.31	4.34	4.38
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	471/1509	4.07	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.56
		uestions reflec			1	6	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	739/1287	4.28	4.28	4.30	4.35	4.30
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	2	2	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	421/1459	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.30	4.54
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	551/1406	3.75	4.04	4.09	4.09	4.29
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute :	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	85/1384	4.57	4.27	4.11	4.09	4.87
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained -	2	0	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	986/1489	3.78	3.90	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	782/1506	4.12	4.52	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	248/1463	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.60
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	675/1438	4.12	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.60
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	639/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.87	
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	580/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.53
		es contribute t			2	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	540/1405	3.85	4.18	4.32	4.39	4.60
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance :	your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	512/1236	4.22	3.76	4.00	4.11	4.22
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	136/1260	4.52	4.21	4.14	4.19	4.91
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1255	4.60	4.40	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1258	4.80	4.54	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	74/ 873	4.34	3.89	4.03	4.04	4.91
		Labora	tory															
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequa	te bac	kground information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.22	4.51	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
20-33		1.00-1.99	U	T 4														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 300 1 University of Maryland Title Comm/Tech - Analysis Baltimore County Instructor: Shipka, Jody L. Fall 2009

University of Maryland Page 675
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11		
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Question	nnaire

	Frequencies							:		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u cain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	Ω	2	4	2	4 00	1114/1509	4.00	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	3	1	1		1463/1509	3.00	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.00
		uations reflect			0	1	1	1	1	2	2		1336/1459	3.43	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.43
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		956/1406	3.88	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.88
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	2		1132/1384		4.27	4.11	4.15	3.63
		g system clearl		-	0	0	2	3	3	0	0		1479/1489	2.13	3.90	4.17	4.14	2.13
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	2	5		1070/1506	4.50	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.50
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	3	0		1338/1463	3.25	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.25
				_														
1 77 1	1	Lectur	_		0	0	0	0	2	_	2	4 00	1002/1420	4 00	4 07	1 16	4 42	4 00
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	3	2	3		1203/1438	4.00	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0 2	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1 2	4	1		1277/1411	3.50	4.24	4.31	4.29	3.50
				-	0	0 5	0	0	2	0	1	3.88	1145/1405 904/1236	3.88	3.76	4.32	4.32	3.88
5. Did au	laiovisua.	ı tecimiques en	nance y	our understanding	U	Э	U	U	2	U	1	3.67	904/1236	3.67	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.25
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.50
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_													_	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1												_		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives						1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					1						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 1 University of Maryland Page 676 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Analysis Literary Lang

Instructor: Farabaugh, Robin

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 16

	I	Fall	2009	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	e e		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	953/1509	4.45	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	1042/1509	4.39	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	924/1287	4.38	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1055/1459	4.39	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	208/1406	4.73	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1009/1384	4.45	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	5	3	3.38	1350/1489	4.13	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	1166/1506	4.58	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	726/1463	4.27	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	675/1438	4.61	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	639/1421	4.87	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	-6		1051/1411	4.41	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	889/1405		4.18	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	354/1236		3.76	4.00	4.07	4.40
	_	_	-	-	_	_	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	558/1260	4.56	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	519/1255	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	907/1258	4.50	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	681/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.57
Frequency Distribution														

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 2 University of Maryland Analysis Literary Lang Title

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 677

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Gwiazda,Piotr K

Instructor:

Quescionna	1105	± /		beddelle eoe	AL DC	пуат	uaci	J11 Q1	ucb c	101111	аттс	•						
							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Question	s		NR	NA		_		4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	574/1509	4.45	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.5
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	796/1509	4.39	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.3
3. Did the	exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	755/1287	4.38	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.2
4. Did oth	er eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	2	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	686/1459	4.39	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.3
5. Did ass	igned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	238/1406	4.73	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.6
6. Did wri	tten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	260/1384	4.45	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.6
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	652/1489	4.13	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.3
8. How man	y times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1194/1506	4.58	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.3
9. How wou	ld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	598/1463	4.27	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.2
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	960/1438	4.61	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.3
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1				881/1421					
				explained clearly		0	0		3				701/1411					
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2			4.44						
	our understanding	1	4	1	0	1	6		4.00									
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ss disc			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	396/1260	4.56	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.5
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	6	7		554/1255					
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5		4.62						
		echniques succe			5	1	0	0	4	2			419/ 873					
		Labora	torv															
2. Were yo	u provi		-	ground information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	***
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge:	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0 #### - Means							_	ſh					
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					1						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 301 3 University of Maryland
Title Analysis Literary Lang Baltimore County

Instructor: Smith, Orianne M

Instructor: Smith,Ori Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 21

Fall 2009	
Student Course Evaluation Question	naire

Page 678

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	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	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4 60	470/1509	4.45	4.05	1 21	4.32	4.62
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	4	15 17	4.62 4.81	201/1509	4.45	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.86	167/1287	4.39	4.13	4.30	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	96/1459	4.39	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	112/1406	4.73	4.22	4.09	4.12	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	71/1384	4.45	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.67	276/1489	4.13	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	523/1463	4.27	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.36
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	U	U	U	,	J	1.30	323/1403	1.2/	1.00	4.00	1.00	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	305/1438	4.61	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1421	4.87	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	267/1411	4.41	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	309/1405	4.50	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	984/1236	3.97	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	201/1260	4.56	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	229/1255	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	350/1258	4.50	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	517/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.92

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 304 1 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

Page 679

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Brit Lit:Medieval/Rena Instructor: Falco,Raphael Fall 2009 Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 28 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	398/1509	4.68	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.68
		tor make clear			3	0	0	0	6	8	11	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	3	0	0	2	1	7	15	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.40
4. Did otl	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.75
				o what you learned	5	1	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	557/1384		4.27	4.11	4.15	4.32
		system clearl		ined	4	0	0	1	2	12	9	4.21	813/1489	4.21	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.21
		was class canc			4	0	0	0	5	17	2		1453/1506		4.52	4.67	4.67	3.88
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	489/1463	4.39	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.39
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.33
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.92
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.50
		s contribute t		-	4 6	0 17	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	406/1405		4.18	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin						1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1236	****	3.76	4.00	4.07	****
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	396/1260	4.53	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.53
				d to participate	13	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	776/1255		4.40	4.33	4.37	4.27
		_		d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.67
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		13	12	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 873	****	3.89	4.03	4.08	****
		Semina	r															
	_	-		announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the	e instruc	tor available	for ind	ividual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	***
			Frequency Dist						ı									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
														- 				
00-27						Re	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		~						1	1		0			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		General					1	Under-g	raa 2	8	Non-	major	5	
84-150 Grad.	4 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 6	D 0 F 0		Electives					1	#### - :	Moona +	horo o	ro not	onomo	rh	
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	O		P 0					_	respons				_	111		
				I 0		∩+1	ther					0	respons	ca LU D	e sign	ııııdı	10	
				<u> </u>		UL.	TICI					U						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 1 University of Maryland Page 680
Title Brit Lit:Restor - Roma Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Smith, Orianne M

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 34

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	Λ	Λ	2	۵	20	4.53	563/1509	4.53	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	10	21	4.59	435/1509	4.59	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	337/1287	4.69	4.13	4.30	4.33	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	36/1406	4.97	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	n	2	Ω	22	4.63	260/1384	4.63	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	555/1489	4.44	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	24	7		1280/1506	4.23	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	13	12	4.42	438/1463	4.42	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.42
J. now would jou grade one overall teaching effectiveness	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	13		1.12	130/1103	1.12	1.00	1.05	1.00	1.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	480/1438	4.73	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	23	4.72	339/1411	4.72	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	877/1236	3.71	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	5	21	4.55	383/1260	4.55	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	453/1255	4.66	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	95/1258	4.97	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.97
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	3	1	3	9	10	3.85	565/ 873	3.85	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.85
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	า									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	34	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 1 University of Maryland Title Brit Lit: Victorian-Mo

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Fernandez,Jean

33 Enrollment: Questionnaire

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 681

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

res:	20	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	Λ	Ω	1	Λ	2	5	12	4.35	778/1509	4.35	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	11	4		1290/1509	3.70	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	614/1287	4.42	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	7	7		1044/1459	3.95	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	400/1406	4.44	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	993/1384	3.83	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	7	3		1315/1489	3.47	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	5	-6	4.06	820/1463		4.00	4.09	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	1166/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	2	6	7	3.83	1174/1411	3.83	4.24	4.31	4.29	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	5	10	4.28	881/1405	4.28	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1236	****	3.76	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	8	7	3.89	872/1260	3.89	4.21	4.14	4.22	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	0	3	1	12	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	1	5	10	4.11	901/1258	4.11	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	731/ 873	3.43	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.43

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA		l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	15	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	#### - Means there a		are not enough	
				P	0			responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	1	=				
				2	Λ							

Course-Section: ENGL 308 1

University of Maryland

Am Lit After Civil War Baltimore County
Gwiazda, Piotr K Fall 2009

Instructor: Gwiazda, Piotr K

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 24

Title

Page 682 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	1021/1509	4.13	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	11	4.04	1056/1509	4.04	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1000/1287	3.93	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	726/1459	4.29	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	366/1406	4.48	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	440/1384	4.41	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	12	4.17	854/1489	4.17	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1006/1506	4.58	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	6	9	6	3.78	1076/1463	3.78	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.78
Lecture	^	^	_	•	_	_	1.0	4	1160/1161	4	4 0=		4 40	4
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	6	5	12		1160/1438		4.27	4.46	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	811/1421	4.79	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5		12		841/1411			4.31	4.29	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4				1145/1405	3.88	4.18		4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	545/1236	4.18	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	4		4.44	. ,	4.44	4.40	4.33	4.22	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	584/1258	4.56		4.38		4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	1	4	6	4.17			3.89			4.17
1. Were special techniques succession	U	U	_	U		-	U	1.1/	303/ 073	7.1/	3.05	1.03	1.00	7.1/
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	Λ	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	****		4.34	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	40			4.41	4.34	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****
From	onarr	Dict	-rih	1+10	_									

Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 1

I ?

Course-Section: ENGL 324 1 University of Maryland Title Theories Of Comm Tech Baltimore County

Instructor: Shipka, Jody L.

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 683

MAR 22, 2010

		0				377		equer 2			-		tructor	Course	_			
		Question	s 		NR	NA		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	2	0	5	5	8	3.85	1251/1509	4.09	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.85
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	4	4	6	6		1290/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	3.70
		uestions reflec			0	14	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	924/1287	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalī	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	1	3	5	4	6	3.58	1283/1459	3.71	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.58
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	776/1406	4.12	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.05
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	6	5	3.71	1083/1384	3.81	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.71
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	1	2	6	6	4	3.53	1295/1489	3.74	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.53
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	1	0	2	13	3	3.89	1449/1506	4.11	4.52	4.67	4.67	3.89
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	1	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1213/1463	3.99	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.58
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture		1	0	_	2	3	4			1322/1438				4.43	3.74	
		n the subject	1	0	0	1	2				1206/1421	4.49		4.73	4.73	4.42		
		xplained clearly		0			2				1170/1411	4.08		4.31	4.29	3.84		
		es contribute t		-	1	1	2	2	2				1185/1405			4.32	4.32	
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	6	2	0	6	3	2	3.23	1082/1236	3.77	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.23
		Discus			_			_	_	_	•		=45/4050					4 00
				what you learned	1		1	2	2	5	9		746/1260		4.21			4.00
				d to participate		0		0				4.37			4.40	4.33	4.37	
				d open discussion	1	0 3	0	1 2	3			4.32	- ,		4.54	4.38	4.42	
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiul		1	3	3	2	2	4	5	3.38	745/ 873	3.79	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.38
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
		0.00-0.99	 1															
00-27	3	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	7	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	5		
28-55	1	B 9		~		,				0	77		0	37		1 -		
56-83	4	C 2		Ge	nera:	Т				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	15		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1			1.
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		ET	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	n
				P 0 T 0		0+	h					0	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcan	I L	
				Ι υ		Ut.	her					0						

Course-Section: ENGL 324 2 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Theories Of Comm Tech Fall 2009

Instructor: Maher,Jennifer

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 684

MAR 22, 2010

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	800/1509	4.09	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	5	9	4.10	1020/1509	3.90	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	658/1287	4.19	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1127/1459	3.71	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	4	12	4.19	656/1406	4.12	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	10	6	3.90	939/1384	3.81	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	9	3.95	1046/1489	3.74	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1205/1506	4.11	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	489/1463	3.99	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	960/1438	4.06	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	11		1115/1421	4.49	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	830/1411	4.08	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	848/1405	4.05	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	441/1236		3.76	4.00	4.07	4.31
o									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	528/1260	4.19	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	575/1255	4.43	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	421/1258	4.53	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	355/ 873	3.79	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.21
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0		7	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 326 1 Title

University of Maryland Structure Of English Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 685 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1194/1509	3.92	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	880/1509	4.23	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	626/1287	4.42	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1154/1384	3.58	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	1082/1489	3.92	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1021/1463	3.86	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1138/1421	4.54	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1115/1405	3.92	4.18	4.32	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1021/1236	3.43	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	904/1260	3.82	4.21	4.14	4.22	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	2	4		1032/1255	3.82	4.40	4.33	4.37	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	2	1	6		1013/1258	3.91	4.54	4.38		3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	2	2	1	0	3	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.00
Posses		- -	1		_									

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 346 1 University of Maryland Literary Themes Baltimore County Falco, Raphael

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

3

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

D

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

Ouestionnaires: 11

16

Page 686 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

7

1

										~			4000	000100	- DCFC	00		200
		Questions	5			NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	661/1509	4.45	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.45
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1164/1509	3.91	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.91
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	826/1287	4.20	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.20
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	536/1459	4.45	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.45
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	4.45	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.45
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	0 1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.55
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1352/1489	3.36	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.36
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1463/1506	3.82	4.52	4.67	4.67	3.82
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teac	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	228/1463	4.64	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.64
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1173/1438	4.10	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.10		
2. Did th	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236	4.33	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.33
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	469/1260	4.44	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.44
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	540/1255	4.56			4.37	4.56
		_	_	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	398/1258	4.78	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.78
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	ssful	-	2	3	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.50
				Free	quenc	y Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	1	Cum. GPA		Ermonted Conde				Da		_							M = = = = = =	
creatts E	armea	Expected Grades	j 			кеа	ason	5 			Тур	,е 			Majors	; 		
00-27	1	A 3		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	3	Graduate	9	0	Majo	or	7		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 6									_	_				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-gr	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	4
04 1 5 0	2	2 00 2 40	^	D 0														

Electives

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 348 1 University of Maryland
Title Literature And Culture Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Corbett,Christo
Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		rom this source	0	0	1	1	0	a	13	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instruct	J ,		0	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam que		1 3	0	17	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	755/1287	4.29	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.29
4. Did other evalua		1 3	0	1	0	0	6	6	11	4.22	814/1459	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.22
5. Did assigned rea		1 3	1	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	200/1406	4.70	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.70
_	_	to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	Ω	12	4.45	394/1384		4.27	4.11	4.15	4.45
7. Was the grading	9	-	1	2	4	4	2	6	5	3.19	1383/1489	3.19	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.19
8. How many times w		Iained	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
-		aching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	4	9	9	4.09	809/1463	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.09
J. How would you gi	ade the Overail tea	actiffing effectiveness	U		_	U	-	,	,	4.00	005/1403	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	4.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	l prepared	6	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instruct	Were the instructor's lectures well preparedDid the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	592/1411	4.53	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.53
4. Did the lectures	_	-	6	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	6	7	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	545/1236	4.18	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.18
	_															
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	o what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	294/1260	4.69	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.69
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instruct	and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	350/1258	4.81	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.81	
	4. Were special techniques successful					0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.89	4.03	4.08	****
	•				21		_									
		Frequ	ıency	וצוע י	cribi	101	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	

Page 687

MAR 22, 2010

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	11
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 351 1 University of Maryland

Ρ

I ? 0

0

0

Title Studies In Shakespeare Instructor: Orgelfinger, Gai

Instructor: Orgel
Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

iversity of Maryland Page 688
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student	Cource	Firelustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5 1	Genera		. 1 . 1	0	0	0	•	0	0	1	4 51	251/1500	4 51	4 05	4 21	4 20	4 51
	ain new insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	351/1509	4.71	4.05 4.13	4.31	4.32	4.71
	nstructor make clear			0	0	0 2	1 0	0	4	16 11	4.67 4.19	356/1509	4.67		4.26 4.30	4.25	4.67 4.19
	xam questions reflec evaluations reflect			0	0	0	1	1 2	1	14	4.19	826/1287 503/1459	4.19 4.48	4.28 4.22	4.30	4.33	4.19
	ned readings contrib			0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.48	112/1406	4.48	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.48
_	ned readings contrib en assignments contr		-	0	0	0	1	1	2	18 17	4.86	225/1384	4.86	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.80
	en assignments contr rading system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	458/1489	4.67	3.90	4.11	4.15	4.67
_	rading system cleari times was class canc		arnea	1	0	0	0	1	17	2		1364/1506	4.05	4.52	4.17	4.14	4.05
_	you grade the overa		shing offoativeness	4	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	367/1463	4.47	4.00	4.07		4.05
9. HOW WOULD	you grade the overa	II Lead	ming effectiveness	4	U	U	U	U	9	0	4.4/	307/1403	4.4/	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.4/
	Lectur																
1. Were the	instructor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	131/1438	4.95	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.95	
	nstructor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
	re material presente	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	,	4.90	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.90	
	ectures contribute t		1	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.18	4.32		4.90
	visual techniques en		2	3	6	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	625/1236	4.08	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.08
	-	-															
	Discus	sion															
1. Did class	discussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	265/1260	4.73	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.73
2. Were all	students actively en	courage	ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/1255	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.91
3. Did the in	nstructor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.91	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.91
4. Were spec	ial techniques succe	ssful		10	0	0	1	3	0	7	4.18	372/ 873	4.18	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.18
			Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits Earn	ed Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	son	S			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0.00-0.99								ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	15
28-55	2 1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	1 2.00-2.99	1	C 5		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	6
	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0 3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh

Other

0

Course-Section: ENGL 371 1 University of Maryland Page 689
Title Creative Writing-Ficti Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Goodman, Ivy H

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1414/1509	3.44	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1002/1509	4.11	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.28	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	78/1384	4.89	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1188/1489	3.78	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1071/1438	4.25	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2			1162/1421	4.50	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	4		885/1411	4.25	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	3	_		1299/1405			4.32	4.32	3.38
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.21	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	526/1255	4.57	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.43
Freq			ribu	ution	ı									
•	-													

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	-	-	
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 373 1

Creative Writing-Poetr

Instructor: Fallon, Michael

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 11

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 690 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			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	1	1	9	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1509	4.91	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	665/1406	4.18	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	235/1463	4.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	646/1438	4.63	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.88	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1236	****	3.76	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.21	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.88	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.88	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 375 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 691

Title Masterworks For Writer MAR 22, 2010 Levine, Elise Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Enrollment: 18

Quebelonnalies. 11 beauche course sydiaction Quebelonnalie	Questionnaires:	14	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire
--	-----------------	----	------------	-------	------------	---------------

Questions								equer			_		ructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect
		Question	S 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you gain n	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	351/1509	4.71	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.28	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did c	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	77/1459	4.93	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.93
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	112/1406	4.86	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.86
6. Did w	written as:	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	89/1384	4.86	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.86
		g system clearl		ned	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	376/1489	4.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.57
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	957/1506	4.64	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How w	would you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.50
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture	_	-	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	197/1438	4.92	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.92
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
				plained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1411	4.92	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.92
		es contribute t	_		2	0 10	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1405		4.18	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did a	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	***	3.76	4.00	4.07	****
	Discussion																	
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	308/1260		4.21	4.14	4.22	4.67
				to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255		4.40	4.33	4.37	4.83
				open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.92
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	***	3.89	4.03	4.08	****
		Labora	-															
		crease understa			13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
		_	_	round information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were	necessary	materials avai	lable fo	r lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 10		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	 aior	 s	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majc	 r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1							-			-	-			
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	3
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0													J				-	
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				6	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0						Otl	her					2	_					
? 0																		

Course-Section: ENGL 380 1 University of Maryland
Title Intro To News Writing Baltimore County

Title Intro To News Writing Baltimore Count Instructor: Weiss, Kenneth N Fall 2009

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 692

MAR 22, 2010

													_	
				eque			_		ructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	872/1509	4.27	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	1	8	4.13	982/1509	4.13	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1010/1287	3.92	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	737/1459	4.29	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	440/1384	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1070/1489	3.93	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	1108/1506	4.47	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	983/1463	3.91	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	930/1438	4.40	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0				11		1107/1421		4.68	4.73	4.73	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	-		0			8	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1		8				4.18	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	474/1236		3.76	4.00		4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	1	_	2 00	908/1260	2 00	4 21	1 11	4.22	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0		1			749/1255	4.30	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0		1		4.44	- ,		4.54	4.38	4.42	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	560/ 873		3.89	4.03	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	O	3	U	1	4	_	3	3.00	300/ 8/3	3.00	3.09	4.03	4.00	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section:ENGL 382 1University of MarylandPage 693TitleFeature WritingBaltimore CountyMAR 22, 2010Instructor:Corbett, ChristoFall 2009Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	25	
Questionnaires:	23	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	_	•	•	2	_	_	0	4 0 4	1006/1500	4 0 4	4 0 5	4 21	4 20	4 0 4
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	9	9		1086/1509		4.05	4.31	4.32	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	Ţ	0	0	2	4	8	8		1086/1509	4.00	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	2	2		****/1287	****	4.28	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	Τ	5	5	10		877/1459	4.14	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	0	3	6	6		1105/1406	3.67	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	15	4.30	570/1384	4.30	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.30
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	0	2	2	9	5	4		1364/1489	3.32	3.90	4.17	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	12		1070/1506		4.52	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	738/1463	4.16	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	3	6	6	3 01	1242/1438	3.94	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	2	6	7		1025/1411	4.06	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.12	,	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	13		0	1	1	1.0		****/1236		3.76	4.00	4.07	****
5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	0	13	U	U	1		U	3.30	71230		3.70	4.00	4.07	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	520/1260	4.39	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	560/ 873	3.86	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.86
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 694

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Science Writing Shivnan, Sally A Instructor: Enrollment: 26

Course-Section: ENGL 383 1

Questionnaires: 16 Student Con	ırse	Eval	uati	on Qı	uesti	lonn	aire	:						
			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1184/1509	3.94	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	731/1509	4.38	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	208/1384	4.69	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	944/1489	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	762/1438	4.53	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	639/1421	4.87	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	4	3	0	3	3.20	1088/1236	3.20	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	776/ 873	3.22	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B C	9 1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0	General	O	onder-grad	10	NOII-lila JOI	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5			are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 385 1

Title New Media, Digital Lit

Instructor: Burgess, Helen J

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 695 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 1		Genera	_	. 1 .	•	•	_	0	0	-	_	4 26	EEO /1500	4 26	4 05	4 21	4 20	4 26
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	5	./	4.36	778/1509	4.36	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.36
		ctor make clear uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	4 1	7 2	4.29	828/1509 ****/1287	4.29 ****	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.29 ****
		uations reflect			0	11 6	0	0	1	7	4	4.67	647/1459	4.38	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.38
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.36	761/1406	4.36	4.22	4.22	4.12	4.36
				o what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	Δ	6	4.27	599/1384	4.27	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.27
		g system clearl			0	0	2	0	0	1	11	4.36		4.36	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.36
		was class canc		IIICG	0	0	0	0	0	8	6		1146/1506	4.43	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.43
				hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	690/1463	4.20	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	396/1438	4.79	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.79
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.43
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	733/1405	4.43	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.43
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	804/1236	3.85	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.85
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	330/1260	4.64	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.64
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1255	4.73	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.73
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.54	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.50
		Labora	_															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
_		acts with the i		_	12	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was th	e feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 `s	6	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	 or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			-			-						3		
F C 0 2	^	0 00 0 00	^	G 0		~		,				4	TT7		4			_

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 1

Adv Expos & Argument

McGurrin, Anthon

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

Title

Instructor:

Page 696 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011760	Evaluation	()110ct10	nnaira

				aner	ncie	=		Tns	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			-		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	1	5	3	3		1484/1509		4.05		4.32	2.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	3	4		1436/1509	4.10	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	0	1		****/1287		4.28	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	3	7		1217/1459	4.20	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	5	3	4		1317/1406		4.04	4.09	4.12	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	954/1384		4.27	4.11	4.15	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	0	5	8	4.00	986/1489		3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	3	2	6			1477/1506		4.52	4.67	4.67	3.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	4	4	4	3.44	1278/1463	3.93	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	0	3	3	4	2.94	1414/1438	3.86	4.27	4.46	4.43	2.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	12		1162/1421	4.61	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	0	4	1			1356/1411		4.24	4.31	4.29	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	0	3	5			1330/1405				4.32	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	0	3	5	2	2.93	1188/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	4.22	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	1010/1255	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.37	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	850/1258	4.51	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	780/ 873	3.89	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
J. Were necessary materials available for lab accivities	Ι,	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 104			1.10	1.52	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Dield Week														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	***	****	4.39	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.18	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.10	4.40	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1/	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 44			4.32	4.40	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 391 1

Adv Expos & Argument

Title Instructor: McGurrin, Anthon

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 696 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 2 University of Maryland Page 697 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Adv Expos & Argument

Instructor: Flanigan,Sean

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	equei	ncies	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	470/1509	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	167/1509	4.10	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.85
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.69	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	xpected goals	1	1	0	2	0	0	9	4.45	536/1459	4.20	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.45
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	313/1406	3.70	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.54
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	385/1384	4.41	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.46
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	422/1489	4.05	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.54
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	832/1506	4.20	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.77
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	545/1463	3.93	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.33
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	660/1438	3.86	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.62
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	2	2			1138/1421		4.68	4.73	4.73	4.54
3. Was lecture mate		_	0	0	0	0	2				482/1411			4.31	4.29	4.62
4. Did the lectures	_	-	0	0	0	1	1	1			605/1405			4.32	4.32	4.54
5. Did audiovisual		-	0	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1120/1236	3.08	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.08
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.42
2. Were all student		-	1	0	0	1	0	1		4.67			4.40		4.37	
3. Did the instruct			1	0	0	0	1	1		4.75			4.54		4.42	
4. Were special tec	_	of	1	2	1	0	4	1		3.70			3.89		4.08	
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	ı									
Credits Earned	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G					Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0.00-0.99	 Д 5			anir	ed fo	 or Ma		 s 1	0	Graduat	 e	0	Maio		6

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

Course-Section: ENGL 391 3 University of Maryland Page 698 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Adv Expos & Argument Fallon, Michael

Instructor: Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 al															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	778/1509	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	1	14	4.45	636/1509	4.10	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the e	xpected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.69	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.71
4. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	146/1459	4.20	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.80
5. Did ass	igned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	4	1	7	3	5	3.20	1299/1406	3.70	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.20
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments conti	ribute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	123/1384	4.41	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.79
7. Was the	grading	g system clear	ly expla	ined	0	1	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	917/1489	4.05	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.11
8. How man	y times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1127/1506	4.20	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How wou	ld you	grade the overa	all tead	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	786/1463	3.93	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.12
		Lectu	re															
1. Were th	e instru	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	1	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	1188/1438	3.86	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.05
2. Did the	instru	n the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	933/1421	4.61	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.72		
3. Was lec	ture mat	explained clearly	2	0							867/1411	3.99	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.28		
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute t	you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	960/1405	4.00	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.17	
5. Did aud	liovisua	our understanding	3	13	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1236	3.08	3.76	4.00	4.07	****		
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cla	ss disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.79
2. Were al	l studer	nts actively er	ncourage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1255	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.93
3. Did the	instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	299/1258	4.51	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.86
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	essful		6	1	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	344/ 873	3.89	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.23
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	utior	n									
	,							_					_					
Credits Ea	.rned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s 			Тур	oe 			Majors	;
00-27							quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.5	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	8
28-55																		
56-83							nera	1				0	Under-gr	rad 2	20	Non-	major	12
84-150															_			
Grad.							ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - N				_	ŗh
				P 0			,					0	response	es to b	e sigr	nifican	it	
				I 0		Ot.	her					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 391 4 University of Maryland Page 699 Title Adv Expos & Argument Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Benson,Linda K

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	3	7	4.00	1114/1509	3.96	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1196/1509	4.10	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	519/1287	4.69	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	0	3	7	3.86	1127/1459	4.20	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	909/1406	3.70	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	349/1384	4.41	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	4	3	3.57	1275/1489	4.05	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	11	1	3.93	1435/1506	4.20	4.52	4.67	4.67	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1036/1463	3.93	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	5	4	3 85	1285/1438	3.86	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	9		979/1421			4.73	4.73	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6			1051/1411			4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4			1010/1405			4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	2	0			****/1236				4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	-	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	746/1260	4.03	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	6		723/1255		4.40	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	1	6		-,			4.38		4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	U T	0	1	2		4.43	,					4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	O	1	U	U		4	4	4.43	250/ 8/3	3.09	3.03	4.03	4.00	4.43
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	 s 1	.0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 r	5

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

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1 University of Maryland Page 700 Title MAR 22, 2010 Tutorial In Writing Instructor: Benson, Linda K Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.21	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.05	4.13	4.26	4.25	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.28	4.30	4.33	5.00
		uations reflect	-	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.26	5.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	332/1406		4.04	4.09	4.12	4.50
		_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384		4.27	4.11	4.15	5.00
		g system clearl		ned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1489	3.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	5.00
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1506		4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	3.69	4.00	4.09	4.08	5.00
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438		4.27	4.46	4.43	5.00
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1411		4.24	4.31	4.29	5.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	1		634/1405		4.18	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.07	5.00
		Discus				_				_								
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260		4.21	4.14	4.22	5.00
				l to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	4.89	4.40	4.33	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	4.72	4.54	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	4.33	3.89	4.03	4.08	5.00
				_			,											
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	atio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior:	 5	2	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1							-			-	-) 0		_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								-	- 2 5				3	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh
	-	2.22 2.30	_	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her					0			5		-	
				? 0														

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Course-Section: ENGL 392 4 University of Maryland Page 701 Tutorial In Writing MAR 22, 2010 Title Instructor: Fallon,Michael
Enrollment: 3 Job IRBR3029

FILL OT THICHE.	5	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.21	4.05	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1509	4.05	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	kpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.28	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	686/1459	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.13	4.04	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	3.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	5.00
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1442/1463	3.69	4.00	4.09	4.08	2.50
		Lectur	_															
		ctor's lecture	-	_	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1438		4.27	4.46	4.43	5.00
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1411	3.95	4.24	4.31	4.29	5.00
		s contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1405			4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.07	5.00
		Discus			_		•	•	•		_		000/4060		4 0 4			4 6 5
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	308/1260			4.14		4.67
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1255		4.40	4.33	4.37	5.00
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1258		4.54	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.33	3.89	4.03	4.08	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 1		Red		ed fo	or Ma	iors	 5	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						. , ~				-	-			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	rh
				Р 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	her					0	-		_			

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 702

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ENGL 392 5 Tutorial In Writing Fall 2009 Fallon,Michael

Title

Instructor:	Fallon,Michael		Fall	2009	
Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course Eval	uation Questionnai	re

			Ex	00110	ncie	a .		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dont	UMBC	Torrol	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
Quescions	1417													
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1509	4.21	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1509	4.05	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	531/1384	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1236/1489	3.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	853/1463	3.69	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1343/1438	4.10	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1257/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1235/1411	3.95	4.24	4.31	4.29	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1047/1405	3.93	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	558/1260	4.36	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.89	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	770/1258	4.72	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.33
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	2	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	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 6 Tutorial In Writing Fallon,Michael

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Page 703 Baltimore County Fall 2009 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Ouestions	7		MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Question								-		Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	l															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.21	4.05	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.05	4.13	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	kpected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.28	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.13	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	986/1489	3.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	3.69	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.67
		Lecture	2															
		ctor's lectures			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1438	4.10	4.27	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1411	3.95	4.24	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute to	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	3.93	4.18	4.32	4.32	5.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	1		0	0	0	1	1	4.50	415/1260		4.21	4.14	4.22	4.50
				d to participate	1		0	0	0	0	2		1/1255	4.89	4.40	4.33	4.37	
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	4.72	4.54	4.38	4.42	5.00
		Semina	=															
				announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 89	5.00	4.62	4.49	4.86	5.00
				ividual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 92		4.67	4.54	4.67	5.00
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contrib	ite to v	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.49	4.50	4.63	5.00
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 2		Per			or Ma	iore		3	 Graduat		0	Majo		2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1000	7 A T T	-u 10	J_ 1/1C	. ,	,	5	Graduat	_	J	1.10.10	/ <u>_</u>	۷
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	u.	-				•	onaci 9		_	1,011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes.				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
0100.	ŭ	3.50 1.00	Ü	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	ner					0	10050110					
				? 0		0.01						-						
				· -														

Course-Section: ENGL 392 7 University of Maryland Page 704 Title Tutorial In Writing Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009 Mabe,Mitzi Instructor:

Enrollment:	2	
Ouestionnaires:	2	

DITT OT TIMETIC .	2				
Questionnaires:	2	Student (Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.21	4.05	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.05	4.13	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	3.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	3.69	4.00	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.10	4.27	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	3.95	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	3.93	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.00
Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 8 University of Maryland Page 705 Title Tutorial In Writing MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Mabe,Mitzi Instructor:

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Ctudant	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire

		0	_			373	Fr	-	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Question	.s 		NR	NA		2	3 	- 4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1473/1509	4.21	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1503/1509	4.05	4.13	4.26	4.25	2.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1314/1459	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	4.13	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	807/1384	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1359/1489	3.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.33
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1434/1463	3.69	4.00	4.09	4.08	2.67
		Lectur																
1 Wara +1	ho ingtr	uctor's lecture	_	aranarad	2	0	0	0	1	Λ	Λ	2 00	1406/1438	4.10	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.00
					2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.62	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clear!				2	0	0	0	1	0	0		1361/1411	3.95	4.00	4.73	4.73	3.00
		es contribute t		-	2	0	0	0	1	0	0		1348/1405		4.18	4.31		3.00
4. DIG tile	e rectur	es contribute t	.O WIIAL	you learned	۷	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	1340/1405	3.93	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.36	4.21	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were a	.11 stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.89	4.40	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.72	4.54	4.38	4.42	5.00
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	rib	utio	n									
C11 T		G GDA		Book and all Considers				ъ.					m				24	
Credits E	arnea	Cum. GPA	\ 	Expected Grades					asons	3 :			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	3	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			_			-						_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					0						

? 0

Course-Section: ENGL 392 9 University of Maryland Page 706 Title Tutorial In Writing MAR 22, 2010 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi

Enrollment: 3 Ouestionnaires: 3

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49 1

3.50-4.00 0

D 0

F 0

I 0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you gain n	new insights, ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1495/1509	4.21	4.05	4.31	4.32	2.67
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	1505/1509	4.05	4.13	4.26	4.25	2.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1457/1459	4.26	4.22	4.22	4.26	2.00
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1379/1384	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.15	2.33
7. Was t	the gradin	ng system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1487/1489	3.57	3.90	4.17	4.14	1.00
8. How r	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	1454/1463	3.69	4.00	4.09	4.08	2.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were	the instr			prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1432/1438	4.10	4.27	4.46	4.43	2.00
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				2	0	0	0	1	0	0		1413/1421		4.68	4.73	4.73	3.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	0		1404/1411		4.24	4.31	4.29	2.00
		res contribute to			2	0	0	1	0	0	0		1396/1405				4.32	
		Discus	gion															
1 Did (alace dico			what you learned	Λ	0	0	1	2	Λ	Λ	2 67	1226/1260	4.36	4.21	4.14	4.22	2.67
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255		4.40	4.33	4.37	4.67
		-	_	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	932/1258		4.54	4.38	4.42	4.00
		echniques succes		d open discussion	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	801/ 873		3.89	4.03		3.00
				P		- -			_									
	Fre						trib	utioi	1									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1			Rec	auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1.0.	1			. , , ,	-	-	2_3000	-	-	- 100) 0	_	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0		0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	1					
04 4 5 0																-		

Electives

Other

0

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1 Title Technical Writing Instructor: Diallo,Mamadou

Enrollment: 24 Que

Page 707 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires: 5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------	--

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1455/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1228/1509	3.97	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1271/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1406	3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	807/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	986/1489	3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1338/1463	3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1343/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1235/1411	4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	828/1405	3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1255	4.04	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	4.39	4.54	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	4.08	***

Frequency Distribution

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

Baltimore County

Page 708

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

Course-Section: ENGL 393 11 University of Maryland Title Technical Writing

Questionnaires: 19 Student Cou	ırse	Evalı	uatio	on Qı	ıesti	ionn	aire							
			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	386/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	519/1509	3.97	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	875/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	209/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	518/1406	3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	251/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	308/1489	3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1014/1506	4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	545/1463	3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	559/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	915/1421	4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	456/1411	4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	432/1405	3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	784/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	746/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	904/1255	4.04	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	818/1258	4.39	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	442/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_		_	
				?	0						

Instructor: Rockett,Danika

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 19 Course-Section: ENGL 393 12 Title Technical Writing Instructor: Jamal,Mahbub

University of Maryland Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 709

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	;		Ins	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 Did vou	asin ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	om this course	1	0	3	2	4	0	2	2 64	1498/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	2.64
		ctor make clear			1	0	4	1	3	1	2		1497/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	2.64
		estions reflec		_	1	7	2	1	1	0	٥		1287/1287		4.28	4.30	4.33	1.75
		ations reflect			1	0	1	2	4	0	4		1356/1459		4.22	4.22	4.26	3.36
				what you learned	1	1	5	0	2	0	3		1389/1406		4.04	4.09	4.12	2.60
				to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	0	4		1251/1384		4.27	4.11	4.15	3.36
		g system clearl			1	1	4	2	3	0	1		1478/1489		3.90	4.17	4.14	2.20
		was class canc		221100	1	0	0	0	0	1	10		583/1506			4.67	4.67	4.91
-	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	3	3			1430/1463		4.00	4.09	4.08	
, 110 m mous	-u 70u <u>-</u>	jiuud diid dveiu	Joan	ming cricocryonoss	_	Ü	_	-	J		Ü	2.75	1130/1103	3.03	1.00	1.05	1.00	2.,,
		Lectur																
		actor's lecture			1	0	2	2	4	1	2		1418/1438		4.27	4.46	4.43	2.91
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	3	3	2	2		1406/1421		4.68	4.73	4.73	3.30
		_		explained clearly	1	0	0	4	3	2			1343/1411			4.31	4.29	3.18
		es contribute t		-	1	0	3	3	2	0	3		1378/1405		4.18	4.32	4.32	2.73
5. Did aud:	iovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	***
		Discus	aion															
1 Did clas	ss discu			what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	****
				ed to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1255		4.40	4.33	4.37	***
		-	_	nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1258		4.54	4.38	4.42	***
		echniques succe			11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 873		3.89	4.03		***
		Tabassa	.															
2 Were voi	u provid	Labora ded with adequa	_	ground information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 198	****	****	4 22	4.17	***
z. were you	a provio	ica wien aacqua	cc bacı	iground information		J	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	1.00	, 100			1.22	1.1,	
		Field							•	•						4 00		
				what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,		***	4.39	4.61	****
2. Dia you	clearly	y understand yo	ur eva.	luation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did self	f-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po	asons				π,				Majors	
CTEATED EQ										, 				ре 				, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge:	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1		Means t			_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						
				3 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 393 13 University of Maryland Technical Writing Baltimore County

Title Instructor: Singh, Yashoda N Fall 2009 Enrollment: 25

56-83

Grad.

84-150

6

4

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

5

3

3

C 0

0

D

Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quescionnaires. 2	beadene con	AL DC	пуат	uacı	OII Q	ucbc.		Idile	-						
	Over the law or	NTD	373			ncies		_		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
	Questions 	NK 	NA 	1	2 	3 	-4 		Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	w insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6		4.15			4.05		4.32	4.15
	tor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45			4.13	4.26	4.25	4.45
	estions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3			4.25			4.28		4.33	4.25
	nations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	6			868/1459		4.22		4.26	4.16
	adings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6			4.11			4.04	4.09	4.12	4.11
	signments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0 1	0 2	3 2			4.55			4.27		4.15	4.55
	system clearly explained was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0			4.10	917/1489 622/1506		3.90 4.52		4.14 4.67	4.10
_	rade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	0	1	7			1148/1463		4.00	4.09	4.07	3.69
9. HOW WOULD YOU 9	grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	1	۷	U		/	3	3.09	1140/1403	3.03	4.00	4.09	4.00	3.03
	Lecture														
1. Were the instru	ctor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	545/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instruc	tor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	1084/1421	4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture mat	erial presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	689/1411	4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.45
4. Did the lecture	es contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	708/1405	3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.45
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	809/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.83
	Discussion														
1. Did class discu	ussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	746/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.00
	its actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3		4.57			4.40	4.33	4.37	4.57
	tor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3		4.63			4.54		4.42	4.63
	echniques successful	13	3	0	0	2	2			****/ 873			4.03	4.08	****
_	_														
1 5 1 1 1 1 1	Laboratory	1.0	0	0	0	0	•		F 00	***** / 104	****	****	4 16	4 05	****
	rease understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184		****	4.16	4.07	****
	led with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198		****	4.22	4.17	****
_	materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184 ****/ 177		****	4.48	4.52	****
	structor provide assistance	19 19	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 165			4.36	4.30	***
5. Were requirement	its for lab reports clearly specified	19	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 105			4.10	4.11	
	Seminar														
	opics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89		4.62	4.49	4.86	***
	tor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00			4.67	4.54	4.67	****
_	rojects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90		4.49	4.50	4.63	***
	ons contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.39	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria f	or grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
	Field Work														
4. To what degree	could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	***
_	s help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	***
	Self Paced		•	•			_	_					4 00	- 00	***
5. Were there enou	gh proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	***
	Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	.
	·														
00-27 1 28-55 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 13 1.00-1.99 0 B 3		Re	quir	ea f	or Ma	ajor	s l	.4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
26-33 0	1.00-1.99 0 B 3		Q -		,				-	TT					1.0

General

Electives

1

1

Under-grad 20

- Means there are not enough

Non-major 19

Page 710 MAR 22, 2010

I

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 711 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	19	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescionnaires.	10	beddelle	COULDE	Evaluation	Quescronnarre

Course-Section: ENGL 393 14

25

Technical Writing Singh, Yashoda N

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

			Fre	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	1	2	2	5	9	4 00	1114/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	720/1509	3.97	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	4	0	7		1053/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	5	11	4.26	759/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	575/1406	3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	430/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	5	11	4.21	802/1489	3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	925/1506	4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	853/1463	3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	9		1063/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	15		1049/1421	4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	3	10	4.21	920/1411	4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	2	10		1047/1405	3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	4	0	8	3.39	1038/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	2	7	3.80	908/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	822/1255	4.04	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	813/1258	4.39	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful			3	1	2	0	7	3.54	694/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.54
1. Here special commiques successful	4	2		-	_	Ü	•	3.31	0,1, 0,3	3.07	3.03	1.05	1.00	3.31
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	4							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18	
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	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				2	0							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Course-Section: ENGL 393 2 Title Technical Writing Diallo,Mamadou Instructor:

Enrollment:

23

1	age	/ 1 2
MAR	22,	2010
Job	IRBI	R3029

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

			Fre	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	1	0	1	1	5	7	2	3.50	1399/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	6	3	4	3.50	1372/1509	3.97	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1212/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	979/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	956/1406	3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1132/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	3	5	3.50	1303/1489	3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	8	2	0	3.00	1392/1463	3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	8	3	2	3 13	1400/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	7	3		1390/1421	4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	4	5	1		1373/1411	4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	6	2	1	4		1375/1405	3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	3	1	1	0	0		1232/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	1.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	6	2	0		1241/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	3	6	2		1127/1255	4.04	4.40	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	910/1258	4.39	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Technical Writing Harris,Linda R

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 713

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	25				
Questionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 3

Title

Instructor:

Conoral	ean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean	Inst 5 Mean	4 !		quenci 2 3	1	NA	NR	Questions					
	06 1042/1000 2 76 4 00 4 21 4 20 2 06	0 2 06	7 (, -	2 4	1	0	0	+b:		General		1 544	
				-		7	•							
						_			3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					
			_											
						-	-							
						_	_	-	_		-	_		
						•	•	-						
							•		ained	7. Was the grading system clearly explained				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						_	-	-	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					
9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 2 3 / 4 3.36 121//1403 3.03 4.00 4.09 4.06 3.3	.50 1217/1403 5.03 4.00 4.09 4.00 5.50	4 3.30	, .	,	2 3	_	U	3	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					
Lecture											Leature			
	.14 1154/1438 4.11 4.27 4.46 4.43 4.14	10 / 1/	0 1/		1 2	1	0	Λ	propared	_		ho inatr	1 Wara +	
			_			0	-							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						-	-							
						-	-	-						
						_	-	-	1					
3. Did additivisual techniques emance your understanding 0 0 0 1 2 6 11 4.32 441/1230 3.00 3.70 4.00 4.07 4.3	.32 441/1230 3.00 3.70 4.00 4.07 4.32	11 4.32	0 1.	٠ (1 2	U	U	U	your understanding	mance	i teciniiques ein	alovisua	J. Did ad	
Discussion										aion	Diagua			
	00 ****/1260 2 80 4 21 4 14 4 22 ****	2 5 00	0 ') (0 0	Ω	Ο	20	what wou learned			agg digg	1 Did al	
			-			-	-							
	.50 /1255 1.01 1.10 1.55 1.57													
	.50 /1250 1.55 1.51 1.50 1.12		_						na open discussion					
4. Wele special techniques successful 20 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 3.07 3.07 3.07 4.03 4.06	.00 7 673 3.07 3.09 4.03 4.00	2 5.00	0 .	, (0 0	U	U	20		SSLUI	eciniiques succes	special t	4. Wele S	
Frequency Distribution					cion	ribut	Dist	ency	Freq					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Type Majors			ons	Reasc				Expected Grades		Cum. GPA	Carned	Credits E	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 18 Required for Majors 18 Graduate 0 Major 0	Graduate 0 Major 0	18	ors	Majo	d for	uire	Req		A 18	0	0.00-0.99	0	00-27	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2									В 2	0	1.00-1.99	0	28-55	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 1 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22	1				eral	Gen		C 0	2	2.00-2.99	0	56-83	
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 6 D 0									D 0	6	3.00-3.49	8	84-150	
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough	#### - Means there are not enough	1		Electives					F 0	6	3.50-4.00	0	Grad.	
P 0 responses to be significant	responses to be significant								P 0					
I 0 Other 1	-	1				er	Oth		I 0					
? 1									? 1					

University of Maryland

Course-Section: ENGL 393 4 Technical Writing Baltimore County Instructor: Harris,Linda R Fall 2009

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions

Title

		2	_				_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1369/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.60
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	4	6	1	4	3.33	1419/1509	3.97	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.33
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	13	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	931/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.07
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1400/1406	3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	2.17
6. Did wri	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	912/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.93
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	3	2	3	4	2	3.00	1403/1489	3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	1205/1506	4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How wou	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1148/1463	3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.69
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	1154/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.13
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	2	3			1257/1421		4.68	4.73	4.73	4.33
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	6			1187/1411			4.31	4.29	3.80
		es contribute t			0	0	2	0	2					3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	3.93
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	346/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.42
		Discus																
ו הים ו				what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2 02	1004/1060	2 00	4 01	1 11	4 00	2 02
				what you learned d to participate	9	0			3	0			1204/1260 1237/1255					
				d to participate d open discussion	10	0	1			1			1126/1258					
		echniques succe		a open arscussion	10	3	0	-	_	_	_		****/ 873					
4. Were St	рестат с	echniques succe	SSIUI		10	3	U	U	Т	U	Т	4.00	/ 6/3	3.07	3.09	4.03	4.00	
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 12						 ajors	. 1	1	Graduate		0	 Majo		3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		Rei	quir.	eu r	OI M	ajors	· 1	. 1	Graduate	=	U	Мајс	T	3
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Co	nera:	1				2	Under-gr	-ad 1	.5	Mon	major	12
84-150	4	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Ge.	nera.	L				4	onder-gr	.au I	.5	MOII-	iiia Jor	12
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	D 0 F 0		₽ 1.	ectiv	700				0	#### - N	loona t	horo a	ro not	onoue	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	O	P 0		ьт	CCLI	ves				U	response				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					0	response	:5 LU L	e sign	ıııcaı	. L	
				T 0		UL.	TICI					U						

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank

Instructor

Page 714 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course-Section: ENGL 393 5 University of Maryland Technical Writing Rockett,Danika Instructor:

Title

Enrollment:

25

Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 715

Ouestionnaires:	22	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation (Questionnaire
Quescionnaires.	22	Student C	ourse	Evaluation (2ues crommari e

							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	u gain new	Genera w insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	1	0	2	10	9	4.18	953/15	na	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.18
_	-	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64			3.70	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.16
		estions reflec			0	7	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	566/12		4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.47
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55			4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.55
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	7	9	4.10	746/14		3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.10
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55			4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.55
		system clearly			0	0	0	2	3	3	14	4.32			3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.32
		was class canc		inea	0	0	0	0	0	11	11		1070/15		4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.50
	-			ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22			3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.22
		Lectur	e																
1 Were tl	he instruc	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	413/14	38	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.77
		or seem inter	_	_	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	846/14		4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.77
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	508/14		4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.59
		s contribute t			0	0	2	0	1	8	11	4.18	947/14		3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.18
			-	our understanding	2	0	1	2	5	5	7	3.75	853/12		3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.75
1 541		Discus		3	11	0	1	0	4	0	4	2 72	050/10	<i>-</i> 0	2 00	4 01	4 1 4	4 00	2 72
				what you learned	11	0	1 0	0	4	2	4	3.73	952/12		3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	3.73
				d to participate	10	0	-	-	2	5	5	4.25	783/12		4.04	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.25
		chniques succe		d open discussion	10 11	0 3	0 2	0	0 2	7 1	5 3	4.42	710/12 745/ 8		4.39 3.67	4.54 3.89	4.38	4.42	4.42
4. Were s	peciai tec	cimiques succe	SSLUI		11	3	4	U	۷	1	3	3.30	745/ 0	13	3.07	3.09	4.03	4.00	3.30
		Labora	-																
		rease understa	_		21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		****	****	4.16	4.07	****
				ground information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	98	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were no	ecessary n	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 1	84	****	****	4.48	4.52	***
		Semina																	
				lvidual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	92	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
	_	9		what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	90	****	4.49	4.50	4.63	****
_		ns contribute		you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	92	****	4.39	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ation	ı										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			,	Тур	е			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8 B 8		Red	quire	ed ic	or M	ajor	s 1	8	Gradu	ate		0	Majo	r	1
28-55	-	1.00-1.99	-			Cos	1					0	TINGON	~~	ad 0	2	Mon	mo iox	21
56-83 84-150	2 9	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	3 5	C 2 D 0		Gei	neral	-				0	Under	-gr	ad 2	۷	MOIJ-	-major	21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		E14	ectiv	res				1	####	_ M	eans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	3	P 0		11.0						-			s to b			_	
				I 0		Otl	ner					0	r cpbo		2 CO D	c pran	LLLCAI		
				? 0		0.01						-							

Course-Section: ENGL 393 8 University of Maryland Title Technical Writing Meade, Vicki L Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 716

Enrollment:	22	
Questionnaires:	14	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1453/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.2
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	828/1509	3.97	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.2
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.6
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	454/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.5
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1166/1406	3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.5
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	570/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.3
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	1	7	3.86	1141/1489	3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.8
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1325/1506	4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.1
$9.\ \mbox{How would}$ you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	1268/1463	3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.4
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	950/1438	4.11	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.3
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	979/1421	4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.6
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	665/1411	4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.4
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	0	9	4.23	911/1405	3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.2
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	373/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.3
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	681/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.1
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1255	4.04	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.5
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.39	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.8
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	178/ 873	3.67	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.6
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	 e	 0	 Majo	 or	0

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	Α	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	0	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 9

Title Technical Writing

Instructor: Singh, Yashoda N

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 717 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		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	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	800/1509	3.76	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	9	4.17	952/1509	3.97	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	426/1287	4.03	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	638/1459	4.19	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	332/1406	3.81	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	403/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	791/1489	3.80	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	820/1506	4.63	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	853/1463	3.63	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.00
T and the second														
Lecture	2	0	0	1	1	4	_	4 40	020/1420	4 11	4 07	1 10	4 42	4 40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	930/1438	4.11		4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	991/1421	4.43	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	768/1411	4.05	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	634/1405	3.99	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	664/1236	3.86	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	666/1260	3.80	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	776/1255	4.04	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	660/1258	4.39	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	705/ 873			4.03		3.50
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
J. WETE CHIEFE ENOUGH PROCEOUS FOR ALL CHE SCUCENCS	Τ./	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 30			1.4/	5.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 9

Title Technical Writing Instructor: Singh, Yashoda N

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 717 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 1 University of Maryland Title Technical Writing

Self Paced

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Sly-Thompson,Al Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

Page 718 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Quebeloimalleb. 10 Beddene eou	IDC	Lvai	uucı	OII Q	20001	. 01111	alle							
			Fr	eque	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	1	3	4	3.90	1214/1509	3.90	4.05	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	668/1287	4.38	4.28	4.30	4.33	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	911/1459	4.10	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	446/1406	4.40	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	677/1384	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1116/1438	4.20	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	841/1411	4.30	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	859/1405	4.30	4.18	4.32	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	3.89	4.03	4.08	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92		4.67	4.54		****
	-	-	-	-	-	_	-		, , , , 2					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 **** **** 4.26 5.00 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 395 1 University of Maryland

Writing Internship Hickernell, Mary (Instr. A) Title Baltimore County Fall 2009 Instructor:

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 719

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

								_					_		_				
		Ouestion	ıs			NR	NA	Fr.	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																	
		ew insights,ski				0	0	1	1	3	2			1114/1509			4.31		4.00
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	1	6	4			1271/1509		4.13	4.26	4.25	3.73
	_	uestions reflec				0	12	0	0	1	1			****/1287		4.28	4.30	4.33	****
		uations reflect				0	0	1	4	3	3			1367/1459		4.22	4.22		3.33
	_	eadings contrik		_		0	0	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1279/1406	3.27	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.27
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute	to what you	learned	0	0	0	4	4	2	5	3.53	1177/1384	3.53	4.27	4.11		3.53
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained		0	0	4	4	3	2	2	2.60	1459/1489	2.60	3.90	4.17	4.14	2.60
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled			1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	807/1506	4.79	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.79
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tea	ching effec	tiveness	2	0	0	2	4	6	1	3.46	1262/1463	3.31	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.31
		Lectur	re																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared		0	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1279/1438	3.86	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.86
		ctor seem inter			ect	0	0	0	0	1	3			1014/1421	4.48	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.48
		terial presente				0	0	1	0	2	4			936/1411			4.31	4.29	4.06
		es contribute t		_	_	0	0	2	1	3	5			1257/1405		4.18	4.32		3.37
		l techniques er		-		0	4	5	1	3	2	0		1215/1236					
		Discus	aion																
1 Did al	aga diga	ussions contrib		what would	oarnod	3	0	0	2	5	2	2	2 /2	1086/1260	3.42	1 21	4.14	4.22	2 /12
		nts actively er		_		3	0	0	4	1	2			1084/1255		4.40	4.33		
		ctor encourage				3	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	,			4.38	4.42	
		echniques succe		na open ars	Cussion	3	0	0	2	3	5	-	3.58	,					
	-	-																	
					Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	4	Expecte	d Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 3					Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3		
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8			-			,						3		
56-83	2	2 00-2 99	0	C	0		Ge:	nera	1				1	IInder-a	rad 1	5	Non-	-maior	12

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majo	rs
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate 0	0 Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad 15	5 Non-majo	r 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means th	here are not end	ugh
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	5			
				?	3					

Course-Section: ENGL 395 1 University of Maryland Title Writing Internship Baltimore County

Fitzpatrick, Car (Instr. B)

3.00-3.49 3

3.50-4.00

Instructor:

3

84-150

Grad.

University of Maryland Page 720
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	16					
Ouestionnaires:	15		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair

D 0

Ρ

I

0

0

0

3

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	э рерт	OMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	ıs		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	1	3	2	8	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	1271/1509	3.73	4.13	4.26	4.25	3.73
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1287	****	4.28	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	4	3	3	4	3.33	1367/1459	3.33	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	4	3.27	1279/1406	3.27	4.04	4.09	4.12	3.27
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	4	4	2	5	3.53	1177/1384	3.53	4.27	4.11	4.15	3.53
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	4	4	3	2	2	2.60	1459/1489	2.60	3.90	4.17	4.14	2.60
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	807/1506	4.79	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.79
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1364/1463	3.31	4.00	4.09	4.08	3.31
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	2	1	4	6	3.86	1282/1438	3.86	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.86
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	1282/1421	4.48	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.48
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	1126/1411	4.06	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.06
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1328/1405	3.37	4.18	4.32	4.32	3.37
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	3	6	1	2	1	0	1.80	1226/1236	1.99	3.76	4.00	4.07	1.99
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	2	5	3	2	3.42	1086/1260	3.42	4.21	4.14	4.22	3.42
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	3	0	0	4	1	2	5	3.67	1084/1255	3.67	4.40	4.33	4.37	3.67
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	867/1258	4.17	4.54	4.38	4.42	4.17
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	677/ 873	3.58	3.89	4.03	4.08	3.58
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 3 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 8					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3	
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ge:	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	12	

Electives

Other

5

5

Frequencies

Course-Section: ENGL 401 1 University of Maryland Page 721 Title Method Of Interpretati Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Berman,Jessica

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	-	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1509	4.93	4.05	4.31	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	459/1509	4.57	4.13	4.26	4.26	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1287	4.86	4.28	4.30	4.38	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	121/1459	4.86	4.22	4.22	4.32	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	200/1406	4.69	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	92/1384	4.85	4.27	4.11	4.23	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	364/1489	4.58	3.90	4.17	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	9	3	4.08	1357/1506	4.08	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	103/1463	4.85	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	175/1438	4.92	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1411	4.85	4.24	4.31	4.35	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.18	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.76	4.00	4.03	4.25
Pianonia														
Discussion	-	0	0	•	_	_		4 05	100/1060	4 05	4 01	4 1 4	4 05	4 05
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	179/1260	4.85	4.21	4.14	4.25	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	254/1255	4.85	4.40	4.33	4.46	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1258	4.92	4.54	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	3.89	4.03	4.26	4.25
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ation	ı									

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 407 1 University of Maryland Language In Society

Title Baltimore County Instructor: McCarthy,Lucill Fall 2009

Page 722

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	20	
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							P L	eque	тстев	3		Inst	ructor	Course	: рерг	OMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.05	4.31	4.39	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	175/1509	4.83	4.13	4.26	4.26	4.83
		uestions reflec			0	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.28	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	131/1459	4.83	4.22	4.22	4.32	4.83
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.04	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	132/1384	4.78	4.27	4.11	4.23	4.78
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1489	4.67	3.90	4.17	4.18	4.67
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	57/1463	4.94		4.09	4.18	4.94
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	131/1438	4.94	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.94
					1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421			4.73		5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear:						0	0	0	1	16	4.94	83/1411			4.31		4.94
		you learned	1 1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	194/1405			4.32				
				our understanding	1	7	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	451/1236			4.00		
		_	_	_														
		Discus																
				what you learned	1		0	0	0		17		1/1260				4.25	
				d to participate	1		0	0	0		17		1/1255					
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1258			4.38		5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	135/ 873	4.71	3.89	4.03	4.26	4.71
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	 А б			guir		 or Ms		 -a 1	6	Graduat		0	Majo		15			
28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	B 8		1/6	durr.	cu I	J_ 1º10	בטני.	υ I	. •	Graduat	_	U	ria JC) <u>+</u>	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		GE	ттст а	_				U	onder -g.	Luu 1	.0	11011-	ilia JUI	J
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						r1	ecti [.]	17AC				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						15.1	CCLI	vca				U	respons				_	111
	I O					O+	her					1	I CBPOIIS		,c 5191.	LLLCai		
1 U ? 1					OL	1101					_							
				· ±														

Frequencies

Instructor

Course-Section: ENGL 410 1

Title Seminar In Genre Studi

Instructor: McKinley, Kathry

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 723 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.90	159/1509	4.90	4.05	4.31	4 20	4 00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	э Т	9 6	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.05	4.31	4.39 4.26	4.90 4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.13	4.20	4.28	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	Ω	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.22	4.22	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	269/1406	4.60	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	, 6	4.56	313/1384	4.56	4.27	4.11	4.23	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	707/1489	4.30	3.90	4.17	4.18	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.60
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.24	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	563/1236	4.17	3.76	4.00	4.03	4.17
~.														
Discussion	_	0	0	^	1	0	2	4 50	415 /1060	4 50	4 01	4 1 4	4 05	4 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	Ţ	0	3	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.21	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255 421/1258	4.75 4.75	4.40	4.33	4.46 4.51	4.75 4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6 6	0	0	0	0	1	3 1	4.75	****/ 873	4./5	3.89	4.38	4.26	4./5
4. Were special techniques successful	О	4	U	U	U	Т	1	4.50	***/ 8/3		3.89	4.03	4.20	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	49/ 89	4.70	4.62	4.49	4.71	4.70
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	36/ 92	4.80	4.67	4.54	4.83	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	37/ 90	4.70	4.49	4.50	4.69	4.70
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	40/ 92	4.63	4.39	4.38	4.64	4.63
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	37/ 93	4.44	4.03	4.06	4.32	4.44

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 449 1 Genre Analysis Instructor: Maher, Jennifer

Title

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

0

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

9

University of Maryland Page 724 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			 Genera	1															
1	Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4 13	1021/1509	4.13	4.05	4.31	4.39	4.13
			ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	1	3	3		1183/1509	3.88	4.13	4.26	4.26	3.88
			uestions reflec			0	7	0	0	0	1	0		****/1287	****	4.28	4.30	4.38	****
			uations reflect			0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	894/1459	4.13	4.22	4.22	4.32	4.13
					what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	587/1406		4.04	4.09	4.11	4.25
		_	-		to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	619/1384		4.27	4.11	4.23	4.25
			g system clearl		-	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	3.90	4.17	4.18	3.50
			was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1335/1506	4.13	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.13
9.	How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.00
			Lectur	·e															
1.	Were th	ne instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1047/1438	4.29	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.29
2.	Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.68	4.73	4.76	4.86
3.	Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	971/1411	4.14	4.24	4.31	4.35	4.14
4.	Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.00
5.	Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.75	3.76	4.00	4.03	4.75
			Discus	sion															
					what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.21	4.14	4.25	4.50
					ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.40	4.33	4.46	4.50
					nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.54	4.38	4.51	4.50
4.	Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	3.89	4.03	4.26	4.25
			Semina																
		_	-		announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 89	4.00	4.62	4.49	4.71	4.00
					dividual attention	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	65/ 92		4.67	4.54	4.83	4.33
					what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	2		84/ 90	3.67	4.49	4.50	4.69	3.67
			ons contribute			5	0	0	1	0	1	1		81/ 92	3.67	4.39	4.38	4.64	3.67
5.	Were cı	riteria 1	for grading mad	le cleai	Î	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	79/ 93	3.00	4.03	4.06	4.32	3.00
					Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Cre	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade				Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	
00	 -27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	6	Graduat	 e	0	Majc	r r	7
28	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4												_		
56	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1				Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	1		
84	-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
	-	_		_									_			-			-

Electives

Other

1

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 451 1 University of Maryland Title Seminar In Major Write Baltimore County

Seminar In Major Write Baltimore County Osherow, Michele Fall 2009

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 725 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 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	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1509	4.91	4.05	4.31	4.39	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.13	4.26	4.26	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1287	****	4.28	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.22	4.22	4.32	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	306/1406	4.55	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	492/1384	4.36	4.27	4.11	4.23	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1169/1489	3.82	3.90	4.17	4.18	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.52	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.00	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.24	4.31	4.35	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1405	4.91	4.18	4.32	4.34	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	512/1236	4.22	3.76	4.00	4.03	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.88	4.21	4.14	4.25	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.88	4.40	4.33	4.46	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.54	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.89	4.03	4.26	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.62	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	57/ 92	4.57	4.67	4.54	4.83	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	57/ 90	4.43	4.49	4.50	4.69	4.43
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.39	4.38	4.64	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	63/ 93	3.88	4.03	4.06	4.32	3.88
Frequ	ency	Dis	crib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2				 ed f	or Ma			 7	 Graduat	 _	0	 Majo		 8
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7		1000	2411	- A I	J_ 1.10	- 101	~	•	Gradat	_	•	1100) (_	Ü

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

Course-Section: ENGL 471 1 University of Maryland Page 726 Title Adv Creative Wrtng:Fic Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Levine,Elise

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							-	ncies	5			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		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	8	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.05	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	424/1509	4.60	4.13	4.26	4.26	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	***	4.28	4.30	4.38	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.88	4.22	4.22	4.32	4.88
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ite to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.80
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	71/1384	4.90	4.27	4.11	4.23	4.90
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1489	4.80	3.90	4.17	4.18	4.80
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1300/1506	4.20	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	177/1463	4.71	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.71
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4 75	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.75
		ctor seem inter	-	_	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.76	5.00
				plained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	190/1411	4.86	4.24	4.31	4.35	4.86
		es contribute to		-	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	513/1405		4.18	4.32		4.63
		Discus					•		•	•	_							
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8		1/1260				4.25	5.00
				d to participate	3		0	0	0	1	6		- ,	4.86	4.40	4.33	4.46	4.86
		_		d open discussion	3	0	0	0	-	0	7	5.00	1/1258		4.54	4.38	4.51	
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssiul		3	2	0	0	0	Τ	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	3.89	4.03	4.26	4.80
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	5			Ту		Majors			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						anir.	ed f	or Ma	ior		3	Graduat	Graduate 1				6	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000	quii	eu I	JI 146	، ١٠٠١	•	5	Graduat	C	1	Majo) <u>T</u>	O
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0 Under-		grad 9		Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	General							•	onacr 9		-	1,011		-
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				4	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
0100.	-	3.33 1.30	-	P 0								-	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>					
				I O	Other						2	100poinded to be bignifficant						
				? 0		2 3222												

University of Maryland Page 727
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 493 1

Seminar In CT

15

Burgess, Helen J

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

	Ouestions				NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran	ıctor (Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	al																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1	509	4.92	4.05	4.31	4.39	4.92
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	1	3	8	4.58	447/1			4.13	4.26	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1			4.28	4.30	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	1	0	8	4.78	173/1			4.22	4.22	4.32	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	164/1			4.04	4.09	4.11	4.75
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	149/1			4.27	4.11	4.23	4.75
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	583/1			3.90	4.17	4.18	4.42
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	12	0		1383/1			4.52	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How w	vould you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	151/1	463	4.75	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.75
		Lectur																	
		ctor's lecture		1 1	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	588/1			4.27	4.46	4.50	4.67
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.68	4.73	4.76	5.00
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67				4.24	4.31	4.35	4.67
		es contribute t		2	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67				4.18	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did a	audiovisual	techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	3	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1	236	4.33	3.76	4.00	4.03	4.33
		Discus																	
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	244/1			4.21	4.14	4.25	4.75
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	443/1			4.40	4.33	4.46	4.67
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1			4.54	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	essful		0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/	873	5.00	3.89	4.03	4.26	5.00
		Semina																	
	_	-		announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/	89	5.00	4.62	4.49	4.71	5.00
				dividual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	92		4.67	4.54	4.83	5.00
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	90		4.49	4.50	4.69	5.00
		ons contribute			9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	92		4.39	4.38	4.64	5.00
5. Were	criteria f	for grading mad	le clear	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/	93	4.67	4.03	4.06	4.32	4.67
				Frequ	iency	Dis	crib	ution	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Type				Majors		;
																	·		1.0
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 3 B 8	Required for Majors						s I	. ∠	Grad	uate	е	0	Majo)r	12
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Cos	nera:	1				0	Under-grad 12			2	Non	-major	0
84-150	9	3.00-2.99	6	D 0		Gel	ıerd.	т				U	unde	т – g.	rau I	∠	NOII-	-ma Jor	U
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0		וק	ectiv	769				0	####	_ 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	J.JU-4.00	J	P O		11.1	LULI	vca				J			es to b				111
P 0						0.1						0	resp	OIIS	co LU L	e sign	ııııcal.	16	

Other

I

0

0