Course-Section: ENGL 100 1　　　　　　　　　University of Maryland
Title　　　　　Composition　　　　　　　　　　Baltimore County
Instructor:　Bloom,Ryan I　　　　　　　　　　Fall　2009
Enrollment:　23
Questionnaires: 17　　　　　　　Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	1174/1509	3.75	4.05	4.31	4.18	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	589/1509	4.09	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1287	4.08	4.28	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	726/1459	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	499/1489	4.04	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1054/1506	4.48	4.52	4.67	4.66	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	489/1463	3.96	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	559/1438	4.27	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	558/1405	4.12	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	545/1236	3.64	3.76	4.00	3.87	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	201/1260	3.99	4.21	4.14	3.95	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged 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 instructor 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 special techniques successful	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 your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  10                University of Maryland                                    Page  629
Title        Composition                       Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Dunnigan,Brian                    Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires:  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  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  4.17  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  3.83  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  4.12  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  3.64  3.76  4.00  3.87  3.69


                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  3.73  3.89  4.03  3.89  3.33


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0   1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.14  ****


                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   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 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  ****


                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      4      0.00-0.99    0      A    8       Required for Majors   6      Graduate     0      Major        0
  28-55      5      1.00-1.99    0      B   10
  56-83      3      2.00-2.99    1      C    0       General              11      Under-grad  20      Non-major   20
  84-150     0      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    8      F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
```

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  11                University of Maryland                                   Page  630
Title         Composition                    Baltimore County                                      MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Brofman,Margare               Fall   2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 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   0   0  2  1  5  8  4  3.55 1384/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31  4.18  3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  1  3 10  5  4.00 1086/1509  4.09  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  11  0  1  1  4  2  3.88 1036/1287  4.08  4.28  4.30  4.24  3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2  0  0  1  9  7  4.35  667/1459  4.17  4.22  4.22  4.11  4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  1  8  6  2  3.39 1243/1406  3.83  4.04  4.09  4.02  3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0  1  0  7 10  4.44  403/1384  4.21  4.27  4.11  3.98  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  1  3  4 10  4.28  738/1489  4.04  3.90  4.17  4.20  4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1506  4.48  4.52  4.67  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1  6  6  4  3.76 1092/1463  3.96  4.00  4.09  4.02  3.76


                 Lecture
1. 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  4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  933/1421  4.66  4.68  4.73  4.66  4.72
3. 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  3.78
4. 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  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 11 2  1  4  0  0  2.29 1211/1236  3.64  3.76  4.00  3.87  2.29


                 Discussion
1. 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  3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  2  0  3  5  6  3.81 1032/1255  4.24  4.40  4.33  4.15  3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1  3  0  5  7  3.88 1025/1258  4.38  4.54  4.38  4.18  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   8  1  0  3  2  1  3.29  765/ 873  3.73  3.89  4.03  3.89  3.29


                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.14  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          18   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36  4.29  ****


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  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  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.39  4.38  4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               19   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  93  ****  4.03  4.06  3.92  ****


                 Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.29  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      19   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.53  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  4.28  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     19   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  4.52  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned      Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     8       0.00-0.99   0      A   10      Required for Majors   3      Graduate     0      Major      0
28-55     4       1.00-1.99   0      B    9                                  Under-grad  20      Non-major 20
56-83     0       2.00-2.99   1      C    0      General              17
84-150    0       3.00-3.49   2      D    0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   1      F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                0
```

?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  14                 University of Maryland                            Page  631
Title         Composition                       Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Brofman,Margare                  Fall   2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      22
Questionnaires:  12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  2  5  3  2  0  2.42 1504/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31  4.18  2.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected 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 expected goals     0   0  1  2  3  4  2  3.33 1367/1459  4.17  4.22  4.22  4.11  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  3  2  3  4  0  2.67 1381/1406  3.83  4.04  4.09  4.02  2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  0  6  1  3  3.25 1286/1384  4.21  4.27  4.11  3.98  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             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 teaching 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 prepared         0   0  2  3  3  1  3  3.00 1406/1438  4.27  4.27  4.46  4.44  3.00
2. Did the instructor 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  4  1  5  1  1  2.50 1388/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32  4.27  2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your 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 what 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 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special 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 lab increase understanding of the material  11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.06  ****
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     5       0.00-0.99    0       A    3       Required for Majors  2       Graduate     0       Major        0
28-55     3       1.00-1.99    0       B    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
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  15                     University of Maryland                                  Page  632
Title          Composition                         Baltimore County                                     MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Wilkinson,Rache                      Fall   2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 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   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

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected 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        B   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
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  16                      University of Maryland                                      Page  633
Title        Composition                            Baltimore County                                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Macek,Philip M.                        Fall   2009                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires: 16                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  1  3  4  7  3.94 1184/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31  4.18  3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  4  2  9  4.19  932/1509  4.09  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  8  1  0  2  0  5  4.00  924/1287  4.08  4.28  4.30  4.24  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  1  2  3  9  4.33  686/1459  4.17  4.22  4.22  4.11  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  3  3  5  4  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  4  2  1  9  3.94  899/1384  4.21  4.27  4.11  3.98  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  4  5  6  4.00  986/1489  4.04  3.90  4.17  4.20  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 15  1  4.06 1360/1506  4.48  4.52  4.67  4.66  4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  2  6  7  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  1  0 14  4.69  559/1438  4.27  4.27  4.46  4.44  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  614/1421  4.66  4.68  4.73  4.66  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63  469/1411  4.22  4.24  4.31  4.27  4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  2  1 13  4.69  432/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32  4.27  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  8  2  0  1  1  4  3.63  925/1236  3.64  3.76  4.00  3.87  3.63


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to 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 all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  287/1255  4.24  4.40  4.33  4.15  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  363/1258  4.38  4.54  4.38  4.18  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  3  1  0  1  7  3  3.92  526/ 873  3.73  3.89  4.03  3.89  3.92


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.14  ****


              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  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.29  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18  4.26  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26  4.28  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      6       0.00-0.99    0      A   10         Required for Majors   4      Graduate     0        Major        0
28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0      B    4
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0      C    1         General              10      Under-grad  16        Non-major   16
84-150     1       3.00-3.49    1      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    4      F    0         Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                       I    0         Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  17              University of Maryland                            Page  634
Title          Composition                 Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Killgallon,Dona              Fall  2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 21              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  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  4.60 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  3.30 1068/1236  3.64  3.76  4.00  3.87  3.30


                 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  3.83 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  3.89 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


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    10        0.00-0.99   2       A    12         Required for Majors   4      Graduate     0        Major        1
  28-55     2        1.00-1.99   0       B     5                                      Graduate     0        Major        1
  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
                                         P     0                                      responses to be significant
                                         I     0         Other                 0
                                         ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  18                University of Maryland                              Page  635
Title           Composition                    Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:     Pekarske,Nicole                Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires: 16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  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  10   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  10   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  575/1255  4.24  4.40  4.33 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  3.73  3.89  4.03 3.89  3.50


               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  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41 4.29  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      15   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  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  3.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32 4.12  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  15   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  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  ****  ****  4.05 4.47  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    15   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 4.21  ****
```

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   10   0.00-0.99   2   A   4   Required for Majors   6   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   7
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   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
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   0
                                           ?   1

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  19                University of Maryland                        Page  636
Title          Composition                  Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Diallo,Mamadou               Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 14              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  7  1  3  2  1  2.21 1507/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31  4.18  2.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  6  3  2  2  2.86 1487/1509  4.09  4.13  4.26  4.25  2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   4  4  1  3  1  1  2.40 1284/1287  4.08  4.28  4.30  4.24  2.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  3  1  3  4  2  3.08 1414/1459  4.17  4.22  4.22  4.11  3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  4  3  2  1  3  2.69 1378/1406  3.83  4.04  4.09  4.02  2.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 4  1  3  3  2  2.85 1349/1384  4.21  4.27  4.11  3.98  2.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  4  2  0  4  2  2.83 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  3.85 1458/1506  4.48  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  4  4  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  2.86 1415/1421  4.66  4.68  4.73  4.66  2.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  4  4  2  3  1  2.50 1395/1411  4.22  4.24  4.31  4.27  2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  7  2  1  2  2  2.29 1392/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32  4.27  2.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 11 1  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  0  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  3  2  0  1  2.57 1238/1255  4.24  4.40  4.33  4.15  2.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1  1  1  2  2  3.43 1164/1258  4.38  4.54  4.38  4.18  3.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   3  2  0  1  0  1  2.50  853/ 873  3.73  3.89  4.03  3.89  2.50
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                   Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    4      0.00-0.99   1         A   6         Required for Majors   2      Graduate    0        Major        0
  28-55    0      1.00-1.99   0         B   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
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0         Other                 0
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  2                    University of Maryland                              Page  637
Title          Composition                     Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Dunnigan,Brian                  Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires: 16                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  2  3 10  4.38  756/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31  4.18  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   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   0  10  0  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. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1 14  4.81  130/1406  3.83  4.04  4.09  4.02  4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  2  3 11  4.56  306/1384  4.21  4.27  4.11  3.98  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            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  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  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  4.66  4.68  4.73  4.66  4.94
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
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
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  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  4.00


                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 ****/ 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 ****/  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
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  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31  4.52  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05  4.47  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      15  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27  4.21  ****
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  2                          University of Maryland                              Page  637
Title          Composition                            Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Dunnigan,Brian                         Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires: 16                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                 Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      6         0.00-0.99    0         A   11       Required for Majors   2     Graduate      0      Major       1
 28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0         B    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
                                             P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                             I    0       Other                 0
                                             ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  20                    University of Maryland                              Page  638
Title        Composition                          Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Sentell,James E                      Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires:  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  1   0  0  0  4  8  7  4.16  987/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31 4.18  4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  1  3  9  6  4.05 1049/1509  4.09  4.13  4.26 4.25  4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  13  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  708/1287  4.08  4.28  4.30 4.24  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1  0  0  1  8  9  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  0  1  4  5  9  4.16  693/1406  3.83  4.04  4.09 4.02  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  5 12  4.61  269/1384  4.21  4.27  4.11 3.98  4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  2  6 11  4.47  499/1489  4.04  3.90  4.17 4.20  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  1  1 10  7  4.21 1287/1506  4.48  4.52  4.67 4.66  4.21
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


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  3  7  9  4.32 1021/1438  4.27  4.27  4.46 4.44  4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  1  3 15  4.74  915/1421  4.66  4.68  4.73 4.66  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  3  7  9  4.32  830/1411  4.22  4.24  4.31 4.27  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1  9  9  4.42  733/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32 4.27  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  1  1  4  5  6  3.82  814/1236  3.64  3.76  4.00 3.87  3.82


                 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  9  4.43  647/1255  4.24  4.40  4.33 4.15  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  468/1258  4.38  4.54  4.38 4.18  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   3  0  0  3  4  4  4.09  419/ 873  3.73  3.89  4.03 3.89  4.09


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16 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. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  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  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39 3.75  ****


                 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  ****

                                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected 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       B    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
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  21                    University of Maryland                                    Page  639
Title          Composition                        Baltimore County                                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Bloom,Ryan I                          Fall   2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 16                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   3   8   4  3.94 1184/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31  4.18  3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   0   5  10  4.44  652/1509  4.09  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   5   9  4.38  647/1459  4.17  4.22  4.22  4.11  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   2   3   6   4  3.63 1128/1406  3.83  4.04  4.09  4.02  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute 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 system clearly explained            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 was class cancelled                  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 grade the overall teaching 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 instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81  348/1438  4.27  4.27  4.46  4.44  4.81
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
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   0   5  10  4.50  617/1411  4.22  4.24  4.31  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   7   9  4.56  577/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32  4.27  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 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 discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   1   0   3   2   7  4.08  722/1260  3.99  4.21  4.14  3.95  4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   2   8   3  4.08  883/1255  4.24  4.40  4.33  4.15  4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair 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                  3   1   0   1   1   6   4  4.08  422/ 873  3.73  3.89  4.03  3.89  4.08


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      7       0.00-0.99    0      A    4       Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0      Major         0
  28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0      B    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
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  22                    University of Maryland                        Page  640
Title           Composition                     Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:     Burns,Margie                    Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 19                       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  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  3.60 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  ****
```

Title   Composition   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Burns,Margie   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   7   0.00-0.99   0   A   3   Required for Majors 5   Graduate   0   Major   1
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   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
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   0
                                           ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  25                    University of Maryland                              Page  641
Title         Composition                        Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Putzel,Diane                       Fall  2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires: 19                    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   1   0   0   0   5   8   5  4.00 1114/1509  3.75 4.05  4.31 4.18  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   3   2   3  10  4.11 1002/1509  4.09 4.13  4.26 4.25  4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  15   0   0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/1287  4.08 4.28  4.30 4.24  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   2   4   4   8  4.00  979/1459  4.17 4.22  4.22 4.11  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2   3   3   3   4   3  3.06 1324/1406  3.83 4.04  4.09 4.02  3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   1   4   6   7  4.06  779/1384  4.21 4.27  4.11 3.98  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1   1   3   3   5   5  3.59 1271/1489  4.04 3.90  4.17 4.20  3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  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 grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   3   5   6  4.21  668/1463  3.96 4.00  4.09 4.02  4.21


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   1   7  10  4.50  800/1438  4.27 4.27  4.46 4.44  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   6  12  4.67 1014/1421  4.66 4.68  4.73 4.66  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained 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 contribute to what 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 techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   0   2   8   8  4.33  421/1236  3.64 3.76  4.00 3.87  4.33


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   1   4   7   4  3.88  880/1260  3.99 4.21  4.14 3.95  3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 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 encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   0   1   3  11  4.67  507/1258  4.38 4.54  4.38 4.18  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1   0   0   3   9   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  18   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 184  **** ****  4.16 4.06  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5         0.00-0.99   0       A  12          Required for Majors   3      Graduate     0        Major        0
  28-55     6         1.00-1.99   0       B   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
                                         P   0                                        responses to be significant
                                         I   0          Other                 1
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  5                    University of Maryland                             Page  642
Title          Composition                      Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Terhorst II,Ray                   Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 18                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  8  8  4.33  800/1509  3.75 4.05 4.31 4.18 4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  0  1 16  4.78  234/1509  4.09 4.13 4.26 4.25 4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  10  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  167/1287  4.08 4.28 4.30 4.24 4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2 15  4.78  173/1459  4.17 4.22 4.22 4.11 4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  2  4 11  4.39  462/1406  3.83 4.04 4.09 4.02 4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1 16  4.83   96/1384  4.21 4.27 4.11 3.98 4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  0  4 13  4.61  330/1489  4.04 3.90 4.17 4.20 4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1506  4.48 4.52 4.67 4.66 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  278/1463  3.96 4.00 4.09 4.02 4.56


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  2 16  4.89  247/1438  4.27 4.27 4.46 4.44 4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1421  4.66 4.68 4.73 4.66 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  1 15  4.82  222/1411  4.22 4.24 4.31 4.27 4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  459/1405  4.12 4.18 4.32 4.27 4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  2  5 10  4.47  298/1236  3.64 3.76 4.00 3.87 4.47


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  136/1260  3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  287/1255  4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  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                   8   1  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  152/ 873  3.73 3.89 4.03 3.89 4.67


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  89  **** 4.62 4.49 4.31 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  92  **** 4.67 4.54 4.16 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  90  **** 4.49 4.50 4.21 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  92  **** 4.39 4.38 4.21 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  93  **** 4.03 4.06 3.92 ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49  **** **** 4.26 4.28 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  **** **** 4.14 4.13 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  **** **** 4.31 4.52 ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      5      0.00-0.99    1      A   10      Required for Majors  5     Graduate      0     Major       1
28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B    8                                Under-grad   18     Non-major  17
56-83      1      2.00-2.99    0      C    0      General             13
84-150     0      3.00-3.49    0      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2      F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                0
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  6                University of Maryland                          Page  643
Title          Composition                    Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Sentell,James E                 Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  1  5 11  4.59  505/1509  3.75  4.05  4.31  4.18  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  6 11  4.65  378/1509  4.09  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  9  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  453/1287  4.08  4.28  4.30  4.24  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the 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 readings contribute to 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 assignments 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 explained           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 was 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 grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2 8 4 4.14 750/1463 3.96 4.00 4.09 4.02 4.14


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  1 11  5  4.24 1086/1438  4.27  4.27  4.46  4.44  4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  322/1421  4.66  4.68  4.73  4.66  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 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 contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  6 11  4.65  486/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32  4.27  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 3 4 5 3 3.53 969/1236 3.64 3.76 4.00 3.87 3.53


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 272/1260 3.99 4.21 4.14 3.95 4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 4 0 10 4.43 647/1255 4.24 4.40 4.33 4.15 4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair 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 techniques successful                 3  3  0  2  4  0  5  3.73  625/ 873  3.73  3.89  4.03  3.89  3.73

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        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        B    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
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  7                    University of Maryland                            Page  644
Title          Composition                      Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Putzel,Diane                      Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 21                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  6  8  5  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  1  0  4  5 11  4.19  922/1509  4.09  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14  0  0  1  4  2  4.14  857/1287  4.08  4.28  4.30  4.24  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  1  9  9  4.30  715/1459  4.17  4.22  4.22  4.11  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  1  8  6  4  3.68 1093/1406  3.83  4.04  4.09  4.02  3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  0  4 15  4.65  234/1384  4.21  4.27  4.11  3.98  4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  3  5  1  5  6  3.30 1367/1489  4.04  3.90  4.17  4.20  3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 14  6  4.30 1222/1506  4.48  4.52  4.67  4.66  4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 1 9  7  4.35  523/1463  3.96  4.00  4.09  4.02  4.35


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  4  5 12  4.38  950/1438  4.27  4.27  4.46  4.44  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  6 15  4.71  950/1421  4.66  4.68  4.73  4.66  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  1  9 10  4.33  810/1411  4.22  4.24  4.31  4.27  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  2  7 11  4.29  874/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32  4.27  4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 3 2  3 10  3.95  730/1236  3.64  3.76  4.00  3.87  3.95


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  2  0  6  5  4.08  722/1260  3.99  4.21  4.14  3.95  4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  1  1  1 10  4.54  554/1255  4.24  4.40  4.33  4.15  4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 3 10  4.77  409/1258  4.38  4.54  4.38  4.18  4.77
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   1  1  0  1  3  7  4.25  333/ 873  3.73  3.89  4.03  3.89  4.25

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 20  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39  3.75  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      5        0.00-0.99    1     A   15        Required for Majors   3      Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55      3        1.00-1.99    0     B    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
                                        P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  8                    University of Maryland                              Page  645
Title         Composition                       Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Bloom,Ryan I                      Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      24
Questionnaires:  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  0   0  2  1  7  8  2  3.35 1432/1509  3.75  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  4.09  4.13  4.26 4.25  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  17  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1287  4.08  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  4.17  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  3.83  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  4.21  4.27  4.11 3.98  4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  5  4 11  4.30  707/1489  4.04  3.90  4.17 4.20  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  1  0  8 10  4.42 1146/1506  4.48  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  4.66  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  556/1411  4.22  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  954/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32 4.27  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 1  5  4  5  0  2.87 1168/1236  3.64  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


             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0  1  0  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. 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 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  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  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  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  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100  9                    University of Maryland                           Page  646
Title         Composition                       Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Bloom,Ryan I                      Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires: 18                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  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  4.09  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  3.73  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  4.00 ****/ 165  ****  ****  4.18  4.15  ****


            Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 1 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  89  ****  4.62  4.49  4.31  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 2 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  ****  4.49  4.50  4.21  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  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                    University of Maryland                         Page  646
Title           Composition                      Baltimore County                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:     Bloom,Ryan I                       Fall   2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 18                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    6         0.00-0.99   1        A    2        Required for Majors   3      Graduate    0      Major       0
 28-55    4         1.00-1.99   1        B    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
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 1                    University of Maryland                                    Page  647
Title         Composition                      Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Brofman,Margare                  Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 18                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                           NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  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
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  3  3  3  9  4.00 1203/1438  4.21  4.27  4.46 4.44  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  4  2  2 10  4.00 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  3.22 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  3.28 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  3.36 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  3.36 1180/1258  4.41  4.54  4.38 4.18  3.36
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  10  0  2  0  1  1  3.25 ****/ 873  3.86  3.89  4.03 3.89  ****


             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  2.50 ****/  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  0  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  0  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  ****


             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  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 11                University of Maryland                          Page  648
Title          Composition                  Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Dunnigan,Brian               Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 19                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  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  4.03  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  3.72  4.04  4.09  4.02  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  1  1  3 14  4.58  299/1384  4.18  4.27  4.11  3.98  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  4  4 11  4.37  641/1489  4.10  3.90  4.17  4.20  4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  1  0  9  9  4.37 1188/1506  4.50  4.52  4.67  4.66  4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3  0  0  0  1  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
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  1  8 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 12  4.37  798/1405  4.14  4.18  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
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  4.50 ****/  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  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  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      17  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05  4.47  ****
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                University of Maryland                        Page  648
Title           Composition                  Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:     Dunnigan,Brian                   Fall  2009                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 19                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          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         B   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
                                          P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                0
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 13              University of Maryland                          Page  649
Title          Composition                Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Killgallon,Dona            Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 20                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

				Freq	uen	cies		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 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	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.62	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.49	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.39	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	****
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	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 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	****
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	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 17                University of Maryland                        Page  650
Title          Composition                  Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Walters,April I              Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   3   3   6   7   3  3.18 1458/1509  3.91  4.05  4.31 4.18  3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   1   1   5   8   7  3.86 1189/1509  4.08  4.13  4.26 4.25  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  17   0   1   2   1   1  3.40 ****/1287  4.03  4.28  4.30 4.24  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2   1   1   8   7   3  3.50 1314/1459  4.19  4.22  4.22 4.11  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  5   3   8   2   2  2.65 1383/1406  3.72  4.04  4.09 4.02  2.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 3 10  5  3.76 1043/1384  4.18  4.27  4.11 3.98  3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   1   4   4   7   6  3.59 1267/1489  4.10  3.90  4.17 4.20  3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1   0   0   1  15   5  4.19 1300/1506  4.50  4.52  4.67 4.66  4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 1 3 10  2  3.65 1181/1463  3.91  4.00  4.09 4.02  3.65


                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  3.53 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  3.47 1135/1255  4.11  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  749/1258  4.41  4.54  4.38 4.18  4.37
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   4   2   2   6   5   0  2.93  824/ 873  3.86  3.89  4.03 3.89  2.93


                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  3.00 ****/  89  ****  4.62  4.49 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0 0 0 0 1  2  4.67 ****/  92  ****  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 4.21  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   19   0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  92  ****  4.39  4.38 4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               19   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  93  ****  4.03  4.06 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 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 4.52  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      19   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.05 4.47  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    19   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 4.21  ****
```

Title   Composition   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Walters,April I   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 22   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   11   0.00-0.99   1   A   5   Required for Majors   8   Graduate   0   Major   0
  28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   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
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   0
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 21              University of Maryland                        Page  651
Title        Composition                  Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Ray,Jennie B.                Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires:  21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  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  5.00 ****/ 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  5.00 ****/  90  ****  4.49  4.50  4.21  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   18   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  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  3.50 ****/  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  4.33 ****/  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  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 25                University of Maryland                                Page  652
Title          Composition                     Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Walters,April I                  Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires: 24                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3  3  6  9  3  3.25 1447/1509  3.91  4.05  4.31 4.18  3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1  4  6  8  5  3.50 1372/1509  4.08  4.13  4.26 4.25  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  17   1  1  2  1  2  3.29 1215/1287  4.03  4.28  4.30 4.24  3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   1  3  4  7  8  3.78 1177/1459  4.19  4.22  4.22 4.11  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   4  1 12  3  3  3.00 1333/1406  3.72  4.04  4.09 4.02  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  3  0  7  8  6  3.58 1154/1384  4.18  4.27  4.11 3.98  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   3  3  6  6  6  3.38 1350/1489  4.10  3.90  4.17 4.20  3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  1  2 13  7  4.13 1330/1506  4.50  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  4.32 1269/1421  4.54  4.68  4.73 4.66  4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   1  2  7  7  4  3.52 1272/1411  4.14  4.24  4.31 4.27  3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   1  1  6  9  5  3.73 1200/1405  4.14  4.18  4.32 4.27  3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0  3  5  5  8  3.86  799/1236  3.86  3.76  4.00 3.87  3.86


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0  5  6  3  6  3.50 1045/1260  4.03  4.21  4.14 3.95  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   1  2  8  4  5  3.50 1127/1255  4.11  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  972/1258  4.41  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 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22 4.14  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48 4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21  1   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36 4.29  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21  1   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 165  ****  ****  4.18 4.15  ****


              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 ****/  90  ****  4.49  4.50 4.21  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21  0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.39  4.38 4.21  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21  0   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 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41 4.29  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21  1   0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51 4.53  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21  1   0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.18 4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21  0   0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32 4.12  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26 4.28  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21  2   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.14 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      21  1   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.31 4.52  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       21  2   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  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  ****
```

                                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   11   0.00-0.99   2   A   9   Required for Majors   7   Graduate   0   Major   0
  28-55   2   1.00-1.99   1   B   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
                                            P   0   responses to be significant
                                            I   0   Other   0
                                            ?   0

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  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  3.93 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
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4       0.00-0.99    1         A    2       Required for Majors   4    Graduate      0     Major        0
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0         B    3
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99    0         C    5       General               6    Under-grad   15     Non-major   15
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49    0         D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2         F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                 0
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 33                University of Maryland                          Page  654
Title        Composition                      Baltimore County                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Sentell,James E                  Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 18                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  5  7  5  3.89 1228/1509  3.91 4.05  4.31 4.18  3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  9  0  0  2  4  3  4.11  875/1287  4.03 4.28  4.30 4.24  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  2  4 11  4.53  432/1459  4.19 4.22  4.22 4.11  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  3  8  6  4.06  776/1406  3.72 4.04  4.09 4.02  4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  2  4 11  4.33  531/1384  4.18 4.27  4.11 3.98  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  3  3 12  4.50  458/1489  4.10 3.90  4.17 4.20  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  883/1506  4.50 4.52  4.67 4.66  4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  1  0  2  7  4  3.93  957/1463  3.91 4.00  4.09 4.02  3.93


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  1  1  2  3 10  4.18 1128/1438  4.21 4.27  4.46 4.44  4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  1  0  0  4 12  4.53 1146/1421  4.54 4.68  4.73 4.66  4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  0  0  4 12  4.53  592/1411  4.14 4.24  4.31 4.27  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  5  1 11  4.35  808/1405  4.14 4.18  4.32 4.27  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  1  0  5  6  2  3.57  950/1236  3.86 3.76  4.00 3.87  3.57


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  4  7  5  4.06  725/1260  4.03 4.21  4.14 3.95  4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  2  7  7  4.31  740/1255  4.11 4.40  4.33 4.15  4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  1  3 12  4.69  493/1258  4.41 4.54  4.38 4.18  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  1  1  0  4  6  4  3.80  585/ 873  3.86 3.89  4.03 3.89  3.80


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 184  **** ****  4.16 4.06  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 198  **** ****  4.22 4.14  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 184  **** ****  4.48 4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 177  **** ****  4.36 4.29  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5      0.00-0.99    0       A   6          Required for Majors   3    Graduate      0     Major       1
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0       B   8
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    1       C   2          General              13    Under-grad   18     Non-major  17
  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
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0          Other                 0
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100A 5                University of Maryland                               Page  655
Title          Composition                 Baltimore County                                    MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Kidd,Kathleen A             Fall   2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 19                  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    1   0  0  2  1  6  9  4.22   911/1509  3.91 4.05  4.31 4.18  4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  1  1  6 10  4.39   720/1509  4.08 4.13  4.26 4.25  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   2  0  2  2  6  6  4.00   924/1287  4.03 4.28  4.30 4.24  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  0  0  8  9  4.53   432/1459  4.19 4.22  4.22 4.11  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1  1  1  3  2 10  4.12   729/1406  3.72 4.04  4.09 4.02  4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  0  0  3 13  4.39   466/1384  4.18 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  4.12  1340/1506  4.50 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  3.86 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  4.03 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  2.00 ****/ 184  **** ****  4.48 4.48  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            18  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 177  **** ****  4.36 4.29  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  18  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 165  **** ****  4.18 4.15  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  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  3.00 ****/  90  **** 4.49  4.50 4.21  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     18  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  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  1.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.51 4.53  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    18  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  47  **** ****  4.18 4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  44  **** ****  4.32 4.12  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  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  1.00 ****/  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  ****
```

                                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected 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   B   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
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   1
                                           ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100H 1                 University of Maryland                              Page  656
Title         Composition - Honors          Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   McCarthy,Lucill                    Fall   2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires: 12                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   143/1509  4.92  4.05  4.31  4.18  4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   104/1509  4.92  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  0  0  1   2  4.67   359/1287  4.67  4.28  4.30  4.24  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  1  10  4.91    96/1459  4.91  4.22  4.22  4.11  4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  1  2  2   7  4.25   587/1406  4.25  4.04  4.09  4.02  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  0  11  5.00     1/1384  5.00  4.27  4.11  3.98  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  5   7  4.58  1006/1506  4.58  4.52  4.67  4.66  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0   1  0  0  0  1  10  4.91    81/1463  4.91  4.00  4.09  4.02  4.91


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83   319/1438  4.83  4.27  4.46  4.44  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  11  4.92   483/1421  4.92  4.68  4.73  4.66  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  10  4.83   211/1411  4.83  4.24  4.31  4.27  4.83
4. 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
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  10  0  0  0  0   2  5.00  ****/1236  ****  3.76  4.00  3.87  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  5   0  0  0  0  0   7  5.00     1/ 873  5.00  3.89  4.03  3.89  5.00


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4         0.00-0.99   1      A   10      Required for Majors   6    Graduate     0     Major        0
 28-55      3         1.00-1.99   0      B    2
 56-83      2         2.00-2.99   0      C    0      General              6    Under-grad  12     Non-major   12
 84-150     0         3.00-3.49   0      D    0
 Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   7      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                               responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100P 1                     University of Maryland                                  Page  657
Title         Composition                          Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Ray,Jennie B.                        Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   17
Questionnaires: 16                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  2  6  7  4.19   953/1509  4.19  4.05  4.31  4.18  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  2  5  9  4.44   652/1509  4.44  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   9   0  0  1  2  3  4.33   708/1287  4.33  4.28  4.30  4.24  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  1  2  4  9  4.31   705/1459  4.31  4.22  4.22  4.11  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   3  0  4  3  6  3.56  1155/1406  3.56  4.04  4.09  4.02  3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0   0  0  1  5  9  4.53   327/1384  4.53  4.27  4.11  3.98  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1  1  3  5  6  3.88  1127/1489  3.88  3.90  4.17  4.20  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0 16  5.00     1/1506  5.00  4.52  4.67  4.66  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0   0  1  1  7  7  4.25   628/1463  4.25  4.00  4.09  4.02  4.25


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0  0  2  5  7  4.36   981/1438  4.36  4.27  4.46  4.44  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0  0  2  2 10  4.57  1107/1421  4.57  4.68  4.73  4.66  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0  0  0  7  7  4.50   617/1411  4.50  4.24  4.31  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0  0  1  6  7  4.43   733/1405  4.43  4.18  4.32  4.27  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  6   1  2  0  2  2  3.29  1072/1236  3.29  3.76  4.00  3.87  3.29


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  2  3  9  4.50   415/1260  4.50  4.21  4.14  3.95  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0  0  2  0 13  4.73   367/1255  4.73  4.40  4.33  4.15  4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0  0  2  2 11  4.60   549/1258  4.60  4.54  4.38  4.18  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   3   0  1  2  3  6  4.17   383/ 873  4.17  3.89  4.03  3.89  4.17


                 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  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. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/   44  ****  ****  4.32  4.12  ****

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      5      0.00-0.99    1      A  11        Required for Majors  14    Graduate    0      Major       0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   3
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C   0        General               0    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
                                       P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                 0
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 1                    University of Maryland                            Page  658
Title          Composition                     Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Mabe,Mitzi                      Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 25                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   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  2.76 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  3.25 ****/1287  3.75  4.28  4.30  4.24  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5   3   4   6   4   3  3.00 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  3.60 ****/  90  4.17  4.49  4.50  4.21  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     20  1   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/  92  4.17  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  3.50 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.53  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    21  2   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  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  4.00 ****/  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  ****
```

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   8   0.00-0.99   0   A   2   Required for Majors   2   Graduate   0   Major   0
  28-55   1   1.00-1.99   0   B   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
                                                P   0   responses to be significant
                                                I   0   Other   0
                                                ?   2

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 3                 University of Maryland                              Page  659
Title         Composition                   Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Hickernell,Mary               Fall  2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   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   6  3.47 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   2  3.94 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


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   0   3   6   7  4.06 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  4.35 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   6  3.94 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  3.94 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  3.77 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   2  3.89  545/ 873  3.46  3.89  4.03 3.89  3.89


                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  5.00 ****/  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  5.00 ****/  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  ****


                Field Work
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  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27 4.21  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 5                     University of Maryland                        Page  660
Title         Composition                         Baltimore County                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Walters,April I                     Fall   2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 12                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  4  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    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  4.27  748/1459  3.91  4.22  4.22 4.11  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 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   0   0  1  1  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  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  3.90

                 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  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. 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  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.39 3.75  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11  0   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  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
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 7                 University of Maryland                          Page  661
Title          Composition                   Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Pekarske,Nicole                  Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  8               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
          -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  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  5.00 ****/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  3.96  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                 7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 873  3.46  3.89  4.03  3.89  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
          -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     8        0.00-0.99    5       A    1       Required for Majors   1    Graduate     0     Major       0
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    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 significant
                                          I    0       Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 110  1                  University of Maryland                           Page  662
Title        Composition ESL Studen          Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Taylor,Paul                     Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  5  10  4.67  410/1509  4.49  4.05  4.31  4.18  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  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  0  1  2  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  1  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  0  0  0  0  3  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 12  4.60  278/1384  4.55  4.27  4.11  3.98  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  2  12  4.73  208/1489  4.65  3.90  4.17  4.20  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   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 2 1 0 0 0 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  199/ 873  4.37  3.89  4.03  3.89  4.54


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  0  0  0  0  1   2  4.67 ****/ 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  4.33 ****/ 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  4.33 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41  4.29  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12  0  0  1  0  0   2  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.51  4.53  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   12  0  0  1  0  0   2  4.00 ****/  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  ****
```

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 15   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   3   0.00-0.99   0   A   11   Required for Majors 8   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   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   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   0
                                        ?   0

```
                                                      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   0   0   3   3   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   3   9  4.62  412/1509   4.71  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   0   2   3   7  4.42  626/1287   4.57  4.28  4.30  4.24  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   3  10  4.57  378/1459   4.59  4.22  4.22  4.11  4.57
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
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned           Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

00-27      2          0.00-0.99   0        A   10         Required for Majors   6       Graduate     0        Major        0
28-55      0          1.00-1.99   1        B    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
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0         Other                 1
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 210  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  664
Title        Introduction To Lit                   Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  McKinley,Kathry                       Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     44
Questionnaires: 33                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  2  2  7 13   9  3.76 1304/1509  3.76 4.05  4.31 4.34  3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  3  8 12  10  3.88 1183/1509  3.88 4.13  4.26 4.32  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  8 10  13  4.03  911/1287  4.03 4.28  4.30 4.35  4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  3 12  8   7  3.63 1254/1459  3.63 4.22  4.22 4.30  3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  3  8  22  4.58  287/1406  4.58 4.04  4.09 4.09  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained             0   0  2  5 10  9   7  3.42 1335/1489  3.42 3.90  4.17 4.19  3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 30   3  4.09 1349/1506  4.09 4.52  4.67 4.61  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0  0  0 11 11   5  3.78 1084/1463  3.78 4.00  4.09 4.08  3.78


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  1  5  8  18  4.24 1078/1438  4.24 4.27  4.46 4.48  4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  7  25  4.73  933/1421  4.73 4.68  4.73 4.76  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  6 12  14  4.15  964/1411  4.15 4.24  4.31 4.37  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  2  2 10  17  4.15  967/1405  4.15 4.18  4.32 4.39  4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 11  7  3  3  3   4  2.70 1185/1236  2.70 3.76  4.00 4.11  2.70


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  1  0  5  8   4  3.78  924/1260  3.78 4.21  4.14 4.19  3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  2  1  3  7   5  3.67 1084/1255  3.67 4.40  4.33 4.37  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15  0  3  0  1  5   9  3.94  980/1258  3.94 4.54  4.38 4.44  3.94
4. Were special techniques successful                   15  4  2  2  4  4   2  3.14  787/ 873  3.14 3.89  4.03 4.04  3.14

         Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32  0  0  0  1  0   0  3.00 ****/ 198  **** ****  4.22 4.51  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0     A  11       Required for Majors  14    Graduate     0      Major       2
 28-55     6      1.00-1.99   0     B   7
 56-83     7      2.00-2.99   1     C   4       General               9    Under-grad  33      Non-major  31
 84-150    0      3.00-3.49   8     D   0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   4     F   0       Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                    I   0       Other                 1
                                    ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 226  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  665
Title      English Grammar Usage                 Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Harris,Linda R                     Fall  2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   42
Questionnaires: 23                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   2   4   7   5   5  3.30 1440/1509  3.30  4.05  4.31  4.34  3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    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 questions reflect the 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 evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings 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 assignments contribute to 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 system clearly explained            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 was 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 grade the overall teaching 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 instructor'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 instructor seem interested in 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 material presented and 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 contribute to what you learned     3   0   2   3   4   2   9  3.65 1223/1405  3.65  4.18  4.32  4.39  3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your 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 discussions 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 actively encouraged to participate 17   0   0   0   1   3   2  4.17  839/1255  4.17  4.40  4.33  4.37  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                  17   4   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 873  ****  3.89  4.03  4.04  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  21   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.54  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.51  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           21   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36  4.65  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 165  ****  ****  4.18  4.56  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  89  ****  4.62  4.49  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  92  ****  4.67  4.54  ****  ****
4. Did presentations 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  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0      A   16        Required for Majors  6     Graduate     0      Major        7
  28-55     3      1.00-1.99   0      B    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
                                      P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other                2
                                      ?    0
```

```
                                                     Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   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  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0   0   0   0   1  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   1   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   1  13  4.59   563/1258  4.59 4.54  4.38 4.44  4.59
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   3   0   1   2   8   3  3.93   517/ 873  3.93 3.89  4.03 4.04  3.93
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                     Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99    1        A    8          Required for Majors   5      Graduate     0        Major        2
  28-55     4         1.00-1.99    0        B    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
                                            P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                            I    0          Other                 2
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 243  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  667
Title          Currents In American L          Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Fitzpatrick,Car                 Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    46
Questionnaires: 29                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   1   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   0   3   3  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  2.50  3.89  4.03  4.04  2.50


                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5        0.00-0.99    1       A   10      Required for Majors   9      Graduate     0       Major        8
  28-55     2        1.00-1.99    0       B   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
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 243  2                University of Maryland                              Page  668
Title        Currents In American L        Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Blumberg,Arnold               Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    50
Questionnaires:  33                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  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   130/1406  4.74 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  4.31 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  4.09  1349/1506  4.55 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  4.55 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  3.11 3.76  4.00 4.11  4.10


                 Discussion
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  4.30 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  4.00  ****/  92  **** 4.67  4.54 **** ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 32   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  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  3.00  ****/  93  **** 4.03  4.06 2.88  ****


                 Field Work
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  4.00  ****/  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 **** ****
```

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 33   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   2   0.00-0.99   1   A   17   Required for Majors 9   Graduate   0   Major   1
 28-55   4   1.00-1.99   0   B   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
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   1
                                         ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENGL 250  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  669
Title         Intro To Shakespeare             Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Farabaugh,Robin                  Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   34
Questionnaires: 24                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   3  0  2 11   8  3.88 1236/1509  3.88  4.05  4.31  4.34  3.88
2. 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  4.04
3. 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  4.42
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  3.83
5. 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  4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   0  2  4  9   8  4.00  807/1384  4.00  4.27  4.11  4.09  4.00
7. 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  3.92
8. 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  4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1   1  0  3 11   5  3.95  918/1463  3.95  4.00  4.09  4.08  3.95


             Lecture
1. 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  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  4  20  4.83  716/1421  4.83  4.68  4.73  4.76  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  2 10  12  4.42  725/1411  4.42  4.24  4.31  4.37  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  2  2  6  14  4.33  828/1405  4.33  4.18  4.32  4.39  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  5   4  3  7  1   3  2.78 1177/1236  2.78  3.76  4.00  4.11  2.78


             Discussion
1. 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  4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0   0  0  1  4  12  4.65  463/1255  4.65  4.40  4.33  4.37  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   1  0  1  4  11  4.41  710/1258  4.41  4.54  4.38  4.44  4.41
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   2   1  1  4  1   6  3.77  605/ 873  3.77  3.89  4.03  4.04  3.77

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected 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       B   13                                                        
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99   2       C    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     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 1
                                        ?    0
```

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 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   0  0  0  0  2  4  14  4.60   482/1509   4.60 4.05  4.31 4.34  4.60
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. 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  4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  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 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  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  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  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  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   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  4.77   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                                  Under-grad  20       Non-major   15
56-83      2       2.00-2.99    3       C   1       General               3
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
                                        P   1                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                 4
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 273  1                University of Maryland                            Page  671
Title         Int Creative Wtg-Poetr        Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   McGurrin,Anthon               Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires: 11               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    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  5.00 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  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0      A   6       Required for Majors  1     Graduate    0      Major       0
  28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0      B   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 enough
                                       P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                1
                                       ?   1
```

```
                                              Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5   Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  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   3.80 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   4.00 ****/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   4.72  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   4.06 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   3.67 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   5.00 ****/1236  4.22  3.76  4.00 4.11  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 4   5   4.40  505/1260  4.52  4.21  4.14 4.19  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 0 2   8   4.80  287/1255  4.60  4.40  4.33 4.37  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   6   4.60  178/ 873  4.34  3.89  4.03 4.04  4.60
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0       A   11       Required for Majors  11   Graduate    0       Major        6
28-55     4       1.00-1.99    0       B    6                                 Under-grad  20      Non-major    14
56-83     5       2.00-2.99    2       C    0       General               5
84-150    2       3.00-3.49    3       D    0                                 #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5       F    0       Electives             1          responses to be significant
                                       P    0
                                       I    0       Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 291  2                University of Maryland                        Page  673
Title        Intro Wrtg Creat Essay        Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  McGurrin,Anthon               Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  26
Questionnaires: 13                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  1  0  5  3  4  3.69 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  3.85 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  3.91 1088/1459  4.22  4.22  4.22  4.30  3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  3  2  2  3  3  3.08 1323/1406  3.75  4.04  4.09  4.09  3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  4  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  3  2  3  5  3.77 1193/1489  3.78  3.90  4.17  4.19  3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  2  5  4  2  3.46 1486/1506  4.12  4.52  4.67  4.61  3.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  0  0  1  7  1  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  5.00 ****/1236  4.22  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

                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     3      0.00-0.99    1       A    4        Required for Majors   9      Graduate     1       Major         4
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    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 significant
                                        I    0        Other                 2
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 291  3            University of Maryland                         Page  674
Title         Intro Wrtg Creat Essay           Baltimore County                      MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Sawyers,Seth A                   Fall   2009                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires: 17                  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    1   0  0  1  1  5  9  4.38   756/1509  3.99  4.05  4.31  4.34  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  3  1 12  4.56   471/1509  4.07  4.13  4.26  4.32  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   6  1  0  1  1  7  4.30   739/1287  4.28  4.28  4.30  4.35  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings contribute 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 assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained             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 cancelled                   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 overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60   248/1463  4.09  4.00  4.09  4.08  4.60


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested 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 material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53   580/1411  4.14  4.24  4.31  4.37  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  1  0  3 11  4.60   540/1405  3.85  4.18  4.32  4.39  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  6  1  0  1  1  6  4.22   512/1236  4.22  3.76  4.00  4.11  4.22


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                   6   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91    74/ 873  4.34  3.89  4.03  4.04  4.91

               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.51  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27     0         0.00-0.99  0      A   8       Required for Majors   6      Graduate      0        Major        3
   28-55     1         1.00-1.99  0      B   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
                                         P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                 0
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 300  1                     University of Maryland                                   Page  675
Title       Comm/Tech - Analysis                Baltimore County                                         MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Shipka,Jody L.                      Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank        Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   4   2  4.00 1114/1509  4.00  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   3   3   1   1  3.00 1463/1509  3.00  4.13  4.26  4.25  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   1   1   1   2   2  3.43 1336/1459  3.43  4.22  4.22  4.26  3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   1   2   2   3  3.88  956/1406  3.88  4.04  4.09  4.12  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   3   2   2  3.63 1132/1384  3.63  4.27  4.11  4.15  3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   3   3   0   0  2.13 1479/1489  2.13  3.90  4.17  4.14  2.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50 1070/1506  4.50  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   1   4   3   0  3.25 1338/1463  3.25  4.00  4.09  4.08  3.25


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   3   2   3  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   0   8  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.68  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   2   1   4   1  3.50 1277/1411  3.50  4.24  4.31  4.29  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   2   5   1  3.88 1145/1405  3.88  4.18  4.32  4.32  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5  0   0   2   0   1  3.67  904/1236  3.67  3.76  4.00  4.07  3.67


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  4   0   0   0   3   0   1  3.50  705/ 873  3.50  3.89  4.03  4.08  3.50


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0        A    3        Required for Majors   2        Graduate     0        Major        6
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0        B    1
  56-83     2        2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General               0        Under-grad   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        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                 1
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 301  1                   University of Maryland                        Page  676
Title          Analysis Literary Lang             Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Farabaugh,Robin                  Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 16                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies           Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  1  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  4.00  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  4.50  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  3.97  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 Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2        0.00-0.99    1        A    2        Required for Majors  13   Graduate     0    Major       14
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    7                                  Under-grad  16    Non-major    2
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99    0        C    4        General               1
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49    1        D    0                                  #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2        F    0        Electives             0           responses to be significant
                                          P    0
                                          I    0        Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 301  2                University of Maryland                              Page  677
Title      Analysis Literary Lang              Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Gwiazda,Piotr K                      Fall   2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  8  9  4.53  574/1509  4.45 4.05  4.31 4.32  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2  7  7  4.31  796/1509  4.39 4.13  4.26 4.25  4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  1  1  5  7  4.29  755/1287  4.38 4.28  4.30 4.33  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  3  4  8  4.33  686/1459  4.39 4.22  4.22 4.26  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  4 12  4.65  238/1406  4.73 4.04  4.09 4.12  4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  6 10  4.63  260/1384  4.45 4.27  4.11 4.15  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  1  6  9  4.35  652/1489  4.13 3.90  4.17 4.14  4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 11  6  4.35 1194/1506  4.58 4.52  4.67 4.67  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  8  5  4.29  598/1463  4.27 4.00  4.09 4.08  4.29


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  3  4  9  4.38  960/1438  4.61 4.27  4.46 4.43  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  881/1421  4.87 4.68  4.73 4.73  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  3  3 10  4.44  701/1411  4.41 4.24  4.31 4.29  4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  2  5  9  4.44  720/1405  4.50 4.18  4.32 4.32  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4  1  0  1  6  4  4.00  664/1236  3.97 3.76  4.00 4.07  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  2  2  9  4.54  396/1260  4.56 4.21  4.14 4.22  4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  6  7  4.54  554/1255  4.67 4.40  4.33 4.37  4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  542/1258  4.50 4.54  4.38 4.42  4.62
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   1  0  0  4  2  5  4.09  419/ 873  3.86 3.89  4.03 4.08  4.09

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  **** ****  4.22 4.17  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type             Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0      A   5       Required for Majors  14    Graduate      0     Major      10
  28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0      B   9
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0      C   1       General               0    Under-grad   17     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 there are not enough
                                      P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I   0       Other                 1
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 301  3                   University of Maryland                                        Page  678
Title         Analysis Literary Lang           Baltimore County                                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Smith,Orianne M                 Fall   2009                                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   23
Questionnaires: 21                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   4  15  4.62  470/1509  4.45  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4  17  4.81  201/1509  4.39  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3  18  4.86  167/1287  4.38  4.28  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  4.22  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  4.04  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   3  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


                 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

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          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        B    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
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other            0
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 304  1                   University of Maryland                                    Page  679
Title          Brit Lit:Medieval/Rena          Baltimore County                                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Falco,Raphael                    Fall   2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires: 28                       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    3   0  0  0  0  8 17  4.68  398/1509   4.68 4.05  4.31 4.32  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  0  6  8 11  4.20  922/1509   4.20 4.13  4.26 4.25  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  2  1  7 15  4.40  638/1287   4.40 4.28  4.30 4.33  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   0  0  1  3  6 14  4.38  647/1459   4.38 4.22  4.22 4.26  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5  1  1  0  2  7 12  4.32  557/1384   4.32 4.27  4.11 4.15  4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0  0  1  2 12  9  4.21  813/1489   4.21 3.90  4.17 4.14  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0  0  0  5 17  2  3.88 1453/1506   3.88 4.52  4.67 4.67  3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9  1  0  0  3  5 10  4.39  489/1463   4.39 4.00  4.09 4.08  4.39

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  1  3  7 13  4.33 1001/1438   4.33 4.27  4.46 4.43  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  0  0  2 22  4.92  483/1421   4.92 4.68  4.73 4.73  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  0  2  8 14  4.50  617/1411   4.50 4.24  4.31 4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  0  0  1  5 18  4.71  406/1405   4.71 4.18  4.32 4.32  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 17  1  1  2  0  1  2.80 ****/1236   **** 3.76  4.00 4.07  ****

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  7  8  4.53  396/1260   4.53 4.21  4.14 4.22  4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  1  0  1  5  8  4.27  776/1255   4.27 4.40  4.33 4.37  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                   13 12  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 ****/ 873   **** 3.89  4.03 4.08  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  89   **** 4.62  4.49 4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92   **** 4.67  4.54 4.67  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0       A  10       Required for Majors  16    Graduate     0      Major      23
28-55      4        1.00-1.99    0       B   4
56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0       C   3       General               1    Under-grad  28      Non-major   5
84-150     4        3.00-3.49    2       D   0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    6       F   0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                 0
                                         ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 305  1                University of Maryland                                    Page  680
Title          Brit Lit:Restor - Roma      Baltimore County                                        MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Smith,Orianne M             Fall   2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 34                  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   2   0   0   0   3   9  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 4.28  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   0   2   8  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  4.23  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


                 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

                             Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected 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      B   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
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 0
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 306  1               University of Maryland                              Page  681
Title        Brit Lit: Victorian-Mo        Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Fernandez,Jean                Fall  2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      33
Questionnaires:  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    0   0  1  0  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  3.70  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  3.95  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  3.47  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   4.06  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


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons                 Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0          0.00-0.99   0      A   8        Required for Majors  13    Graduate    0      Major      15
 28-55      0          1.00-1.99   0      B   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 there are not enough
                                         P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                 1
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 308  1                    University of Maryland                              Page 682
Title       Am Lit After Civil War             Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Gwiazda,Piotr K                    Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    34
Questionnaires: 24                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                     NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  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. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  0  6  5 12  4.13 1160/1438  4.13  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  6 12  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  3  1  4  4 12  3.88 1145/1405  3.88  4.18  4.32 4.32  3.88
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 11  4.44  629/1255  4.44  4.40  4.33 4.37  4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 1 0 5 12  4.56  584/1258  4.56  4.54  4.38 4.42  4.56
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  6  1  0  1  4  6  4.17  383/ 873  4.17  3.89  4.03 4.08  4.17


             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  4.00 ****/  89  ****  4.62  4.49 4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.67  4.54 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  90  ****  4.49  4.50 4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  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 0  1.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.39 4.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  48  **** ****  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  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected 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       B   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
```

```
P    0                                                responses to be significant
I    0            Other            1
?    2
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 324  1                    University of Maryland                                 Page  683
Title      Theories Of Comm Tech                  Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Shipka,Jody L.                         Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires: 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   0   0   2  0  5  5   8  3.85 1251/1509  4.09 4.05  4.31 4.32  3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  4  4  6   6  3.70 1290/1509  3.90 4.13  4.26 4.25  3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14   0  1  1  1   3  4.00  924/1287  4.19 4.28  4.30 4.33  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   1  3  5  4   6  3.58 1283/1459  3.71 4.22  4.22 4.26  3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained            1   0   1  2  6  6   4  3.53 1295/1489  3.74 3.90  4.17 4.14  3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   1  0  2 13   3  3.89 1449/1506  4.11 4.52  4.67 4.67  3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1   0  1  5  4   2  3.58 1213/1463  3.99 4.00  4.09 4.08  3.58


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   2  2  3  4   8  3.74 1322/1438  4.06 4.27  4.46 4.43  3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  1  2  4  12  4.42 1206/1421  4.49 4.68  4.73 4.73  4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1  3  2  5   8  3.84 1170/1411  4.08 4.24  4.31 4.29  3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1   2  2  2  4   8  3.78 1185/1405  4.05 4.18  4.32 4.32  3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  6   2  0  6  3   2  3.23 1082/1236  3.77 3.76  4.00 4.07  3.23


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   1  2  2  5   9  4.00  746/1260  4.19 4.21  4.14 4.22  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0  0  3  6  10  4.37  698/1255  4.43 4.40  4.33 4.37  4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0   0  1  3  4  11  4.32  784/1258  4.53 4.54  4.38 4.42  4.32
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   3   3  2  2  4   5  3.38  745/ 873  3.79 3.89  4.03 4.08  3.38

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3       0.00-0.99    1        A   6       Required for Majors  17     Graduate     1       Major        5
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0        B   9                                                        
  56-83      4       2.00-2.99    2        C   2       General               0     Under-grad  19       Non-major   15
  84-150     2       3.00-3.49    3        D   0
  Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    3        F   0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I   0       Other                 0
                                           ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 324  2                    University of Maryland                          Page  684
Title          Theories Of Comm Tech            Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Maher,Jennifer                      Fall   2009                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 21                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  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  4.56 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  3.77 3.76  4.00 4.07  4.31

                 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

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0       A   7        Required for Majors  16     Graduate      0       Major        13
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B   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
                                         P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                 0
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 326  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  685
Title      Structure Of English                Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Fitzpatrick,Car                 Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  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  3.82 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  3.91 1013/1258  3.91  4.54  4.38  4.42  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

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned           Cum. GPA       Expected Grades         Reasons                Type              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     B    4                               Under-grad  13     Non-major   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 significant
                                         I    0     Other                1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 346  1                University of Maryland                              Page  686
Title       Literary Themes                 Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Falco,Raphael                   Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires:  11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  2  2  7  4.45   661/1509  4.45 4.05  4.31 4.32  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  6  2  3.91  1164/1509  3.91 4.13  4.26 4.25  3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45   536/1459  4.45 4.22  4.22 4.26  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55   320/1384  4.55 4.27  4.11 4.15  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  2  2  4  2  3.36  1352/1489  3.36 3.90  4.17 4.14  3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  3  7  1  3.82  1463/1506  3.82 4.52  4.67 4.67  3.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64   228/1463  4.64 4.00  4.09 4.08  4.64


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  1  1  4  4  4.10  1173/1438  4.10 4.27  4.46 4.43  4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00     1/1421  5.00 4.68  4.73 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and 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 the lectures 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1   7  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   421/1236  4.33 3.76  4.00 4.07  4.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  2  0  7  4.56   540/1255  4.56 4.40  4.33 4.37  4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                 2   3  1  0  2  1  2  3.50   705/ 873  3.50 3.89  4.03 4.08  3.50


                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 348  1              University of Maryland                        Page  687
Title        Literature And Culture        Baltimore County                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Corbett,Christo                  Fall  2009                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires:  24              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  1  0  9 13  4.33   800/1509  4.33  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     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 questions reflect the expected goals    0  17  0  0  2  1  4  4.29   755/1287  4.29  4.28  4.30  4.33  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  6  6 11  4.22   814/1459  4.22  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  2  3 18  4.70   200/1406  4.70  4.04  4.09  4.12  4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0  0  2  8 12  4.45   394/1384  4.45  4.27  4.11  4.15  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             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 was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0 23  5.00     1/1506  5.00  4.52  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  1  0  4  9  9  4.09   809/1463  4.09  4.00  4.09  4.08  4.09


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well 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 instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00     1/1421  5.00  4.68  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material 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 contribute to what you learned      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 discussions contribute to 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 students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair 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                   8  13  1  0  0  1  1  3.33  ****/ 873  ****  3.89  4.03  4.08  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   14        Required for Majors  8     Graduate      0       Major       13
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    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 enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                0
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 351  1              University of Maryland                          Page  688
Title        Studies In Shakespeare        Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Orgelfinger,Gai              Fall   2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 21                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  2 17  4.71  351/1509  4.71  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  0  4 16  4.67  356/1509  4.67  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  2  0  1  7 11  4.19  826/1287  4.19  4.28  4.30  4.33  4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  1  2  4 14  4.48  503/1459  4.48  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86  112/1406  4.86  4.04  4.09  4.12  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  1  2 17  4.67  225/1384  4.67  4.27  4.11  4.15  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  2  6 12  4.50  458/1489  4.50  3.90  4.17  4.14  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  1 17  2  4.05 1364/1506  4.05  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  9  8  4.47  367/1463  4.47  4.00  4.09  4.08  4.47


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  131/1438  4.95  4.27  4.46  4.43  4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0 20  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.68  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  138/1411  4.90  4.24  4.31  4.29  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  172/1405  4.90  4.18  4.32  4.32  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  6  1  0  2  3  6  4.08  625/1236  4.08  3.76  4.00  4.07  4.08


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                   10  0  0  1  3  0  7  4.18  372/ 873  4.18  3.89  4.03  4.08  4.18

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0       0.00-0.99    1        A    3        Required for Majors  13      Graduate      0        Major        15
 28-55     2       1.00-1.99    0        B    6                                                             
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99    1        C    5        General               0      Under-grad   21        Non-major     6
 84-150    3       3.00-3.49    0        D    0                                                             
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2        F    0        Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 371  1                    University of Maryland                            Page  689
Title         Creative Writing-Ficti            Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Goodman,Ivy H                     Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   13
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
         --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  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  5  4.50 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  4.25  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  2  3.38 1299/1405  3.38  4.18  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


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        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       B    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
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                2
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 373  1              University of Maryland                          Page  690
Title       Creative Writing-Poetr        Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Fallon,Michael                  Fall   2009                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   12
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   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 3  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 3 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 Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected 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      B    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 are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 375  1                 University of Maryland                              Page 691
Title        Masterworks For Writer          Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Levine,Elise                      Fall  2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   18
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  2  0 12  4.71  351/1509  4.71  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  300/1509  4.71  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  10  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1287  5.00  4.28  4.30  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93   77/1459  4.93  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 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 written assignments contribute 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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  0  3 10  4.57  376/1489  4.57  3.90  4.17  4.14  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64  957/1506  4.64  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  1  4  7  4.50  325/1463  4.50  4.00  4.09  4.08  4.50


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  197/1438  4.92  4.27  4.46  4.43  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.68  4.73  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0  0  0  1 11  4.92  124/1411  4.92  4.24  4.31  4.29  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  154/1405  4.92  4.18  4.32  4.32  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1236  ****  3.76  4.00  4.07  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  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 2  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  262/1255  4.83  4.40  4.33  4.37  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 techniques successful                 2  10  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 873  ****  3.89  4.03  4.08  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.17  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.52  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       0       0.00-0.99    0    A   10      Required for Majors  4    Graduate      0     Major        11
28-55       0       1.00-1.99    0    B    1                                Under-grad   14     Non-major     3
56-83       2       2.00-2.99    2    C    0      General              0
84-150      3       3.00-3.49    3    D    0                                Under-grad   14     Non-major     3
Grad.       0       3.50-4.00    1    F    0      Electives            6    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                2
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 380  1              University of Maryland                           Page  692
Title        Intro To News Writing          Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Weiss,Kenneth N                Fall   2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 16              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   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  1  1  1 11  4.57  1107/1421  4.57  4.68  4.73  4.73  4.57
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     2  0  0  1  1  4  8  4.36   808/1405  4.36  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  4.27  3.76  4.00  4.07  4.27


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  1  2  1  5  3.80   908/1260  3.80  4.21  4.14  4.22  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  3  1  6  4.30   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  2  1  6  4.44   680/1258  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  3.86  3.89  4.03  4.08  3.86

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   1       A   4      Required for Majors  10     Graduate     0        Major        4
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99   0       B   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
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                 0
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 382  1                  University of Maryland                         Page  693
Title        Feature Writing                   Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Corbett,Christo                    Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires:  23                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  3  2  9  9  4.04 1086/1509  4.04  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0  2  4  8  8  4.00 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  4.20 ****/1287  ****  4.28  4.30  4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0  1  5  5 10  4.14  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  3.67 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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   2  2  9  5  4  3.32 1364/1489  3.32  3.90  4.17  4.14  3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  1  9 12  4.50 1070/1506  4.50  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  3.94 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  4.06 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  3  2 10  4.12  994/1405  4.12  4.18  4.32  4.32  4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 13  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1236  ****  3.76  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

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0       A   7        Required for Majors  12   Graduate    0        Major        8
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99   0       B  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
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other           1
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 383  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  694
Title       Science Writing                    Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Shivnan,Sally A                    Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
Questionnaires: 16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  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 Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1         0.00-0.99    0      A   5        Required for Majors  9       Graduate     0       Major        6
  28-55      0         1.00-1.99    0      B   9                                                          
  56-83      1         2.00-2.99    0      C   1        General              0       Under-grad  16       Non-major   10
  84-150     3         3.00-3.49    3      D   0                                                          
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    4      F   0        Electives            5       #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                1
                                          ?   0
```

| | | | Freq | uenc | ies | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	778/1509	4.36	4.05	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	828/1509	4.29	4.13	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	****	4.28	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	761/1406	4.07	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	599/1384	4.27	4.27	4.11	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	1	11	4.36	652/1489	4.36	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1146/1506	4.43	4.52	4.67	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	690/1463	4.20	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	396/1438	4.79	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.68	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.24	4.31	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	804/1236	3.85	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	330/1260	4.64	4.21	4.14	4.22	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1255	4.73	4.40	4.33	4.37	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	3.89	4.03	4.08	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 391  1               University of Maryland                              Page  696
Title       Adv Expos & Argument          Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  McGurrin,Anthon              Fall   2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 18                   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   1   0   5   1   5   3   3  2.88 1484/1509  3.96  4.05  4.31  4.32  2.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   2   3   5   3   4  3.24 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  5.00 ****/1287  4.69  4.28  4.30  4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   2   1   4   3   7  3.71 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  3.12 1317/1406  3.70  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  4.41  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  4.05  3.90  4.17  4.14  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   1   3   2   6   5  3.65 1477/1506  4.20  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  4.50 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   5  3.07 1356/1411  3.99  4.24  4.31  4.29  3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   1   4   0   3   5   3  3.20 1330/1405  4.00  4.18  4.32  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  5.00 ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.52  ****


            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  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  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  ****  ****  4.14  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  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		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	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 391  2                University of Maryland                           Page  697
Title        Adv Expos & Argument             Baltimore County                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Flanigan,Sean                    Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  470/1509  3.96  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 questions 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 evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings 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 assignments 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 explained            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 was 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 grade the overall teaching 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 instructor'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 instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  2  2  9  4.54 1138/1421  4.61  4.68  4.73  4.73  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  1 10  4.62  482/1411  3.99  4.24  4.31  4.29  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  1  1 10  4.54  605/1405  4.00  4.18  4.32  4.32  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 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 discussions 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 students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1  0  1 10  4.67  443/1255  4.45  4.40  4.33  4.37  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0  1  1 10  4.75  421/1258  4.51  4.54  4.38  4.42  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   2  1  0  4  1  4  3.70  636/ 873  3.89  3.89  4.03  4.08  3.70

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A    5      Required for Majors  10      Graduate     0       Major        6
  28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0       B    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
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 1
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 391  3                  University of Maryland                              Page  698
Title       Adv Expos & Argument              Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Fallon,Michael                   Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  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   0   0   0   1   1   8  10  4.35   778/1509  3.96  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    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 questions reflect the expected goals   0  13   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   304/1287  4.69  4.28  4.30  4.33  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2  17  4.80   146/1459  4.20  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 system clearly explained            0   1   0   1   4   6   8  4.11   917/1489  4.05  3.90  4.17  4.14  4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  11   9  4.45  1127/1506  4.20  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  1   0   0   2  11   4  4.12   786/1463  3.93  4.00  4.09  4.08  4.12


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   4   5   9  4.28   867/1411  3.99  4.24  4.31  4.29  4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 13  2   0   0   0   2  3.00  ****/1236  3.08  3.76  4.00  4.07  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  6   1   1   0   1   4   7  4.23   344/ 873  3.89  3.89  4.03  4.08  4.23


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors  15     Graduate    0      Major       8
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    7
  56-83      5      2.00-2.99    1      C    0      General               0     Under-grad  20     Non-major  12
  84-150     5      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   11      F    0      Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 0
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 391  4                    University of Maryland                              Page  699
Title        Adv Expos & Argument                Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Benson,Linda K                      Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 14                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  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  4.69  979/1421  4.61  4.68  4.73  4.73  4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 2 6 4  4.00 1051/1411  3.99  4.24  4.31  4.29  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  1  1  0  4  6  4.08 1010/1405  4.00  4.18  4.32  4.32  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 9 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/1236  3.08  3.76  4.00  4.07  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 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 4.33  723/1255  4.45  4.40  4.33  4.37  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1 0 1 1 6 4.22 834/1258  4.51  4.54  4.38  4.42  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  1  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  250/ 873  3.89  3.89  4.03  4.08  4.43

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0        A   6     Required for Majors  10   Graduate      0      Major        5
  28-55      2     1.00-1.99    0        B   5                               Under-grad   14      Non-major    9
  56-83      4     2.00-2.99    0        C   1     General               1   Under-grad
  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 significant
                                         I   0     Other                 0
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  700
Title        Tutorial In Writing                 Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Benson,Linda K                      Fall   2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    3
Questionnaires:  2                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  598/1509  4.21  4.05  4.31 4.32  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1509  4.05  4.13  4.26 4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1287  5.00  4.28  4.30 4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1459  4.26  4.22  4.22 4.26  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  332/1406  4.13  4.04  4.09 4.12  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1384  4.38  4.27  4.11 4.15  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1489  3.57  3.90  4.17 4.14  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  2 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  0  0  2 5.00    1/1463  3.69  4.00  4.09 4.08  5.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1438  4.10  4.27  4.46 4.43  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1421  4.62  4.68  4.73 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1411  3.95  4.24  4.31 4.29  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  634/1405  3.93  4.18  4.32 4.32  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1236  5.00  3.76  4.00 4.07  5.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1260  4.36  4.21  4.14 4.22  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1255  4.89  4.40  4.33 4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                   0   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/ 873  4.33  3.89  4.03 4.08  5.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  4                   University of Maryland                            Page  701
Title          Tutorial In Writing              Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Fallon,Michael                    Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      3
Questionnaires:  3                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies           Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1509   4.21  4.05  4.31  4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1287   5.00  4.28  4.30  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  686/1459   4.26  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1489   3.57  3.90  4.17  4.14  5.00
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  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 1442/1463   3.69  4.00  4.09  4.08  2.50


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   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   2   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 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1411   3.95  4.24  4.31  4.29  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1405   3.93  4.18  4.32  4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1236   5.00  3.76  4.00  4.07  5.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  308/1260   4.36  4.21  4.14  4.22  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1255   4.89  4.40  4.33  4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1258   4.72  4.54  4.38  4.42  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 873   4.33  3.89  4.03  4.08  5.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  5                   University of Maryland                              Page  702
Title         Tutorial In Writing              Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Fallon,Michael                   Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires: 3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  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


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A    1          Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0        Major        1
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    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
                                            P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                            I    0          Other                0
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  6                University of Maryland                              Page  703
Title           Tutorial In Writing        Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:     Fallon,Michael                  Fall  2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires: 3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1509  4.21 4.05  4.31 4.32  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   2   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1287  5.00 4.28  4.30 4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1459  4.26 4.22  4.22 4.26  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  1  1  1  4.00  986/1489  3.57 3.90  4.17 4.14  4.00
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 0 0 0  0  0  1  2  4.67  209/1463  3.69 4.00  4.09 4.08  4.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   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   2   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 2  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1411  3.95 4.24  4.31 4.29  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1405  3.93 4.18  4.32 4.32  5.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  415/1260  4.36 4.21  4.14 4.22  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1255  4.89 4.40  4.33 4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1258  4.72 4.54  4.38 4.42  5.00


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  89  5.00 4.62  4.49 4.86  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  92  5.00 4.67  4.54 4.67  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/  90  5.00 4.49  4.50 4.63  5.00


                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  7                University of Maryland                                    Page  704
Title           Tutorial In Writing            Baltimore County                                     MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:     Mabe,Mitzi                      Fall   2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
Questionnaires: 2                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean Mean Mean Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   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

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0        A   0      Required for Majors  1    Graduate    0      Major      1
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0        B   1
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99   0        C   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
                                        P   0                               responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                0
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  8                University of Maryland                        Page  705
Title          Tutorial In Writing              Baltimore County                       MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Mabe,Mitzi                       Fall   2009                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      3
Questionnaires:  3                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  1  0  1  0  1 3.00 1473/1509  4.21  4.05  4.31 4.32  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  1  0  2  0  0 2.33 1503/1509  4.05  4.13  4.26 4.25  2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   1  0  0  1  1  0 3.50 1314/1459  4.26  4.22  4.22 4.26  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained              0   0  1  0  0  1  1 3.33 1359/1489  3.57  3.90  4.17 4.14  3.33
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 0  0  0  1  2  0  0 2.67 1434/1463  3.69  4.00  4.09 4.08  2.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          2   0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 1406/1438  4.10  4.27  4.46 4.43  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     2   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  2   0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 1361/1411  3.95  4.24  4.31 4.29  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       2   0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 1348/1405  3.93  4.18  4.32 4.32  3.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1258  4.72  4.54  4.38 4.42  5.00

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 392  9                University of Maryland                            Page  706
Title          Tutorial In Writing               Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Mabe,Mitzi                        Fall   2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    3
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  2  0  0  2.67 1495/1509  4.21  4.05  4.31  4.32  2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1  1  1  0  0  2.00 1457/1459  4.26  4.22  4.22  4.26  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained            0   0   3  0  0  0  0  1.00 1487/1489  3.57  3.90  4.17  4.14  1.00
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  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 instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1432/1438  4.10  4.27  4.46  4.43  2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1413/1421  4.62  4.68  4.73  4.73  3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1404/1411  3.95  4.24  4.31  4.29  2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1396/1405  3.93  4.18  4.32  4.32  2.00


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  1  2  0  0  2.67 1226/1260  4.36  4.21  4.14  4.22  2.67
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  0  3  0  4.00  932/1258  4.72  4.54  4.38  4.42  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   1   0  0  2  0  0  3.00  801/ 873  4.33  3.89  4.03  4.08  3.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  1                University of Maryland                        Page  707
Title       Technical Writing               Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Diallo,Mamadou                 Fall   2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires:  5               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  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 Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   4      Required for Majors  3    Graduate     0      Major        0
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   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
                                       P   0                               responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                0
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  11                University of Maryland                                    Page  708
Title        Technical Writing                 Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Rockett,Danika                    Fall   2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires:  19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   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 Earned         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       B    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
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 0
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  12                 University of Maryland                              Page  709
Title        Technical Writing                  Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Jamal,Mahbub                       Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires:  12                 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    1   0   3  2  4  0   2  2.64 1498/1509  3.76  4.05  4.31 4.32  2.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   4  1  3  1   2  2.64 1497/1509  3.97  4.13  4.26 4.25  2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   7   2  1  1  0   0  1.75 1287/1287  4.03  4.28  4.30 4.33  1.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   1  2  4  0   4  3.36 1356/1459  4.19  4.22  4.22 4.26  3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1   5  0  2  0   3  2.60 1389/1406  3.81  4.04  4.09 4.12  2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  0  5  0   4  3.36 1251/1384  4.20  4.27  4.11 4.15  3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   1   4  2  3  0   1  2.20 1478/1489  3.80  3.90  4.17 4.14  2.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  1  10  4.91  583/1506  4.63  4.52  4.67 4.67  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  1  4  3  3   0  2.73 1430/1463  3.63  4.00  4.09 4.08  2.73


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   2  2  4  1   2  2.91 1418/1438  4.11  4.27  4.46 4.43  2.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0  3  3  2   2  3.30 1406/1421  4.43  4.68  4.73 4.73  3.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0  4  3  2   2  3.18 1343/1411  4.05  4.24  4.31 4.29  3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   3  3  2  0   3  2.73 1378/1405  3.99  4.18  4.32 4.32  2.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/1236  3.86  3.76  4.00 4.07  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1260  3.80  4.21  4.14 4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1255  4.04  4.40  4.33 4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1258  4.39  4.54  4.38 4.42  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  0   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 873  3.67  3.89  4.03 4.08  ****


                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22 4.17  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  11  0   1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.39 4.61  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  11  0   1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.41 4.34  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0   1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.26 5.00  ****


                          Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0       A    4        Required for Majors  9       Graduate     0        Major       0
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0       B    6
56-83      1        2.00-2.99    1       C    1        General              1       Under-grad  12        Non-major  12
84-150     4        3.00-3.49    2       D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3       F    0        Electives            1       #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                0
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  13                University of Maryland                                 Page  710
Title       Technical Writing               Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Singh,Yashoda N               Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 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    0   0  1  1  2  6 10  4.15  987/1509  3.76  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  5 12  4.45  636/1509  3.97  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   4  1  0  3  2 10  4.25  779/1287  4.03  4.28  4.30  4.33  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  2  2  6  9  4.16  868/1459  4.19  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  0  6  1 11  4.11  739/1406  3.81  4.04  4.09  4.12  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  3 14  4.55  313/1384  4.20  4.27  4.11  4.15  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  2  2  4 11  4.10  917/1489  3.80  3.90  4.17  4.14  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1  0  0  0  2 16  4.89  622/1506  4.63  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  1  2  0  1  7  3  3.69 1148/1463  3.63  4.00  4.09  4.08  3.69


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor'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 instructor 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 material 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 lectures 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 discussions 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  526/1255  4.04  4.40  4.33  4.37  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  535/1258  4.39  4.54  4.38  4.42  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  3  0  0  2  2  0  3.50  ****/ 873  3.67  3.89  4.03  4.08  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.17  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.52  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 177  ****  ****  4.36  4.30  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 165  ****  ****  4.18  4.11  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  89  ****  4.62  4.49  4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.67  4.54  4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  90  ****  4.49  4.50  4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.39  4.38  4.73  ****
5. Were criteria for 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  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  44  ****  ****  4.32  4.40  ****


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.27  5.00  ****


                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99    0       A   13        Required for Majors  14     Graduate      0      Major        1
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    3
  56-83     6        2.00-2.99    5       C    0        General               1     Under-grad   20      Non-major   19
  84-150    4        3.00-3.49    3       D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    3       F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
```

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  14              University of Maryland                         Page  711
Title         Technical Writing            Baltimore County                             MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Singh,Yashoda N              Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires: 19                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  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  3.85 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  4.26 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  4.63 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  4.00 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 4 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                  4   2  3  1  2  0  7  3.54  694/ 873  3.67  3.89  4.03 4.08  3.54

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type               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       B   4
 56-83     4      2.00-2.99    1       C   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
                                       P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                 0
                                       ?   0
```

Title   Technical Writing   Baltimore County   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Diallo,Mamadou   Fall   2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 17   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    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  3.63 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  2.94 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  2.81 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  1.60 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  2.50 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  3.50 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 Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A    8       Required for Majors  12      Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    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
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                 0
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  3                  University of Maryland                              Page  713
Title      Technical Writing                 Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Harris,Linda R                 Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires: 22                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  1  2  4  7  8  3.86 1243/1509  3.76 4.05  4.31 4.32  3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  2  1  2  7 10  4.00 1086/1509  3.97 4.13  4.26 4.25  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  13  0  0  2  2  5  4.33  708/1287  4.03 4.28  4.30 4.33  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  1  6 13  4.48  503/1459  4.19 4.22  4.22 4.26  4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2  2  1  3  5  9  3.90  934/1406  3.81 4.04  4.09 4.12  3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3  8 11 4.36  492/1384  4.20 4.27  4.11 4.15  4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  2  2  5  4  9  3.73 1210/1489  3.80 3.90  4.17 4.14  3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  1  0  1 12  8  4.18 1305/1506  4.63 4.52  4.67 4.67  4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 2 5  7  4  3.58 1217/1463  3.63 4.00  4.09 4.08  3.58


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  1  1  2  8 10  4.14 1154/1438  4.11 4.27  4.46 4.43  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  5  4 12  4.33 1257/1421  4.43 4.68  4.73 4.73  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  1  3  7 11  4.27  867/1411  4.05 4.24  4.31 4.29  4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  1  1  4  6 10  4.05 1028/1405  3.99 4.18  4.32 4.32  4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 2  8 11  4.32  441/1236  3.86 3.76  4.00 4.07  4.32


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00 ****/1260  3.80 4.21  4.14 4.22  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 0  1  1  4.50 ****/1255  4.04 4.40  4.33 4.37  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 0 0 1  1  4.50 ****/1258  4.39 4.54  4.38 4.42  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 20  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 873  3.67 3.89  4.03 4.08  ****

                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0        A   18       Required for Majors  18     Graduate     0       Major        0
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0        B    2
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    2        C    0       General               1     Under-grad  22       Non-major   22
  84-150    8        3.00-3.49    6        D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    6        F    0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                 1
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  4                University of Maryland                              Page  714
Title      Technical Writing                   Baltimore County                            MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Harris,Linda R                     Fall   2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires:  15              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  5  4   4  3.60 1369/1509  3.76  4.05  4.31  4.32  3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  13  1  0  0  1   0  2.50 ****/1287  4.03  4.28  4.30  4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  2  9   3  4.07  931/1459  4.19  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 grading system clearly explained            0   1  3  2  3  4   2  3.00 1403/1489  3.80  3.90  4.17  4.14  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  1  4   9  4.33 1205/1506  4.63  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  1  5  4   3  3.69 1148/1463  3.63  4.00  4.09  4.08  3.69


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  1  1  4   8  4.13 1154/1438  4.11  4.27  4.46  4.43  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  2  3   9  4.33 1257/1421  4.43  4.68  4.73  4.73  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  2  3  6   4  3.80 1187/1411  4.05  4.24  4.31  4.29  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  2  0  2  4   7  3.93 1106/1405  3.99  4.18  4.32  4.32  3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  1  1  2   8  4.42  346/1236  3.86  3.76  4.00  4.07  4.42


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  1  3  0   1  2.83 1204/1260  3.80  4.21  4.14  4.22  2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  1  1  2  1   0  2.60 1237/1255  4.04  4.40  4.33  4.37  2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  1  0  1  1   2  3.60 1126/1258  4.39  4.54  4.38  4.42  3.60
4. Were special techniques successful                 10   3  0  0  1  0   1  4.00 ****/ 873  3.67  3.89  4.03  4.08  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                   Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0       A   12        Required for Majors  11     Graduate    0       Major        3
  28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0       B    1
  56-83      2        2.00-2.99    3       C    0        General               2     Under-grad  15      Non-major   12
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49    0       D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    8       F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                 0
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  5                    University of Maryland                              Page  715
Title       Technical Writing                  Baltimore County                              MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Rockett,Danika                    Fall   2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires: 22                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  2 10  9  4.18   953/1509  3.76  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  4 16  4.64   390/1509  3.97  4.13  4.26  4.25  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  0  1  6  8  4.47   566/1287  4.03  4.28  4.30  4.33  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  0  1  4 16  4.55   410/1459  4.19  4.22  4.22  4.26  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  0  4  7  9  4.10   746/1406  3.81  4.04  4.09  4.12  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  0  6 15  4.55   320/1384  4.20  4.27  4.11  4.15  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  2  3  3 14  4.32   696/1489  3.80  3.90  4.17  4.14  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 11 11  4.50  1070/1506  4.63  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0 14  4  4.22   658/1463  3.63  4.00  4.09  4.08  4.22


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  3 18  4.77   413/1438  4.11  4.27  4.46  4.43  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  3 18  4.77   846/1421  4.43  4.68  4.73  4.73  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  7 14  4.59   508/1411  4.05  4.24  4.31  4.29  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  0  1  8 11  4.18   947/1405  3.99  4.18  4.32  4.32  4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  1  2  5  5  7  3.75   853/1236  3.86  3.76  4.00  4.07  3.75


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  4  2  4  3.73   952/1260  3.80  4.21  4.14  4.22  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  2  5  5  4.25   783/1255  4.04  4.40  4.33  4.37  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  0  0  0  7  5  4.42   710/1258  4.39  4.54  4.38  4.42  4.42
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  3  2  0  2  1  3  3.38   745/ 873  3.67  3.89  4.03  4.08  3.38


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   21  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 198  ****  ****  4.22  4.17  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 21 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 184  ****  ****  4.48  4.52  ****


                 Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.67  4.54  4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  21 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  90  ****  4.49  4.50  4.63  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      21 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  92  ****  4.39  4.38  4.73  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  21 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  93  ****  4.03  4.06  3.94  ****


                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99   0      A   8        Required for Majors  18   Graduate   0      Major      1
  28-55     0         1.00-1.99   0      B   8
  56-83     2         2.00-2.99   3      C   2        General               0   Under-grad 22      Non-major 21
  84-150    9         3.00-3.49   5      D   0
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   5      F   0        Electives             1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                 0
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  8                University of Maryland                        Page  716
Title        Technical Writing              Baltimore County                          MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Meade,Vicki L                  Fall   2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
Questionnaires:  14              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3   1   3   4   3  3.21 1453/1509  3.76  4.05  4.31  4.32  3.21
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  4.29
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  4.67
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  4.50
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  3.54
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  4.31
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  3.86
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  4.14
9. 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  3.45


             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  4.38
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  4.69
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  4.46
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  4.23
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  4.38


             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  4.17
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  4.50
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  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   1   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  178/ 873  3.67  3.89  4.03  4.08  4.60

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    1       A   7        Required for Majors  10     Graduate    0      Major       0
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B   3
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99    3       C   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
                                          P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                 0
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393  9                 University of Maryland                              Page  717
Title      Technical Writing                Baltimore County                               MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Singh,Yashoda N               Fall   2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 18                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  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


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0  1  1   4   9  4.40  930/1438  4.11  4.27  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  3.67  3.89  4.03  4.08  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  5.00 ****/ 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  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  ****


            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  ****  ****  4.14  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  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENGL 393E 1                    University of Maryland                            Page  718
Title      Technical Writing                   Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Sly-Thompson,Al                   Fall   2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires:  10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   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   0  4.00 ****/  89  ****  4.62  4.49  4.86  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  92  ****  4.67  4.54  4.67  ****


            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  ****


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


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   7      Required for Majors  8    Graduate     0       Major       0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   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
                                       P   0                               responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                0
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 395  1                    University of Maryland                              Page  719
Title       Writing Internship                   Baltimore County                                MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Hickernell,Mary (Instr. A)           Fall  2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
         ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1  1  3  2  8  4.00 1114/1509  4.00  4.05  4.31  4.32  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  1  6  4  4  3.73 1271/1509  3.73  4.13  4.26  4.25  3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  12   0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/1287  ****  4.28  4.30  4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1  4  3  3  4  3.33 1367/1459  3.33  4.22  4.22  4.26  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained            0   0   4  4  3  2  2  2.60 1459/1489  2.60  3.90  4.17  4.14  2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0  0  0  3 11  4.79  807/1506  4.79  4.52  4.67  4.67  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  2  4  6  1  3.46 1262/1463  3.31  4.00  4.09  4.08  3.31


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  2  3  5  5  3.87 1279/1438  3.86  4.27  4.46  4.43  3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  1  3 11  4.67 1014/1421  4.48  4.68  4.73  4.73  4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1  0  2  4  8  4.20  936/1411  4.06  4.24  4.31  4.29  4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2  1  3  5  4  3.53 1257/1405  3.37  4.18  4.32  4.32  3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4  5  1  3  2  0  2.18 1215/1236  1.99  3.76  4.00  4.07  1.99


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  3   0   0  2  3  5  2  3.58  677/ 873  3.58  3.89  4.03  4.08  3.58


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                     Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27     0       0.00-0.99    1         A    3        Required for Majors   2     Graduate     0       Major        3
   28-55     3       1.00-1.99    0         B    8
   56-83     2       2.00-2.99    0         C    0        General               1     Under-grad  15       Non-major   12
   84-150    3       3.00-3.49    3         D    0
   Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    7         F    0        Electives             5     #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                 5
                                            ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 395  1                 University of Maryland                            Page  720
Title        Writing Internship               Baltimore County                           MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  Fitzpatrick,Car (Instr. B)         Fall  2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  3  2  8  4.00 1114/1509  4.00  4.05  4.31 4.32  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  6  4  4  3.73 1271/1509  3.73  4.13  4.26 4.25  3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  12  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/1287  ****  4.28  4.30 4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  4  3  3  4  3.33 1367/1459  3.33  4.22  4.22 4.26  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained            0   0  4  4  3  2  2  2.60 1459/1489  2.60  3.90  4.17 4.14  2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  807/1506  4.79  4.52  4.67 4.67  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1  2  4  4  1  3.17 1364/1463  3.31  4.00  4.09 4.08  3.31

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  1  2  1  4  6  3.86 1282/1438  3.86  4.27  4.46 4.43  3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and 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 the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3  6  1  2  1  0  1.80 1226/1236  1.99  3.76  4.00 4.07  1.99

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  3   0  0  2  3  5  2  3.58  677/ 873  3.58  3.89  4.03 4.08  3.58

                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons               Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1       A    3      Required for Majors   2    Graduate     0      Major       3
 28-55      3      1.00-1.99    0       B    8
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    0       C    0      General               1    Under-grad  15      Non-major  12
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49    3       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7       F    0      Electives             5    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                 5
                                        ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 401  1                   University of Maryland                              Page  721
Title          Method Of Interpretati          Baltimore County                                 MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:    Berman,Jessica                  Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 14                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank       Mean  Mean Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   1  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


                 Discussion
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


                                        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        B    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
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                 0
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 407  1                    University of Maryland                                    Page  722
Title        Language In Society                  Baltimore County                                    MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:  McCarthy,Lucill                       Fall   2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:  18                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  0  0  18  5.00    1/1509   5.00 4.05  4.31 4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  3  15  4.83  175/1509   4.83 4.13  4.26 4.26  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  13   0  0  0  0   5  5.00    1/1287   5.00 4.28  4.30 4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  3  15  4.83  131/1459   4.83 4.22  4.22 4.32  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  2  2  14  4.67  276/1489   4.67 3.90  4.17 4.18  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  6  12  4.67  941/1506   4.67 4.52  4.67 4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94   57/1463   4.94 4.00  4.09 4.18  4.94


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0  0  0  1  16  4.94  131/1438   4.94 4.27  4.46 4.50  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0  0  0  0  17  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  1  16  4.94   83/1411   4.94 4.24  4.31 4.35  4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0  0  0  2  15  4.88  194/1405   4.88 4.18  4.32 4.34  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  7  0  2  0  1   7  4.30  451/1236   4.30 3.76  4.00 4.03  4.30


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1260   5.00 4.21  4.14 4.25  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1255   5.00 4.40  4.33 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1258   5.00 4.54  4.38 4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   0   0  0  1  3  13  4.71  135/ 873   4.71 3.89  4.03 4.26  4.71


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0       A    6       Required for Majors  16     Graduate      0     Major       15
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    8
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    2       C    0       General               0     Under-grad   18     Non-major    3
  84-150    10      3.00-3.49    5       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 1
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 410  1                      University of Maryland                              Page  723
Title         Seminar In Genre Studi             Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   McKinley,Kathry                    Fall  2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:  10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1   9  4.90  159/1509  4.90  4.05  4.31  4.39  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  3   6  4.50  543/1509  4.50  4.13  4.26  4.26  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4   6  4.60  426/1287  4.60  4.28  4.30  4.38  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2   8  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


              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
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  1  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  4.75  4.40  4.33  4.46  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  1   3  4.75  421/1258  4.75  4.54  4.38  4.51  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   2  0  0  0  1   1  4.50  ****/ 873  ****  3.89  4.03  4.26  ****


              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 Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0          0.00-0.99   0       A    4          Required for Majors  9    Graduate     0       Major        10
  28-55     2          1.00-1.99   0       B    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
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                0
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENGL 449  1                     University of Maryland                              Page  724
Title       Genre Analysis                       Baltimore County                                   MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Maher,Jennifer                          Fall   2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  8                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
             ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  1  0  4  3  4.13 1021/1509  4.13  4.05  4.31 4.39  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  1  3  3  3.88 1183/1509  3.88  4.13  4.26 4.26  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1287  ****  4.28  4.30 4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  0  0  3  4  4.13  894/1459  4.13  4.22  4.22 4.32  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  587/1406  4.25  4.04  4.09 4.11  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  0  2  5  4.25  619/1384  4.25  4.27  4.11 4.23  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  3  2  2  3.50 1303/1489  3.50  3.90  4.17 4.18  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  7  1  4.13 1335/1506  4.13  4.52  4.67 4.67  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  6  0  4.00  853/1463  4.00  4.00  4.09 4.18  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented 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 lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  126/1236  4.75  3.76  4.00 4.03  4.75


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  415/1260  4.50  4.21  4.14 4.25  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  575/1255  4.50  4.40  4.33 4.46  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                   0   0  0  1  0  3  4  4.25  333/ 873  4.25  3.89  4.03 4.26  4.25

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   67/  89  4.00  4.62  4.49 4.71  4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   65/  92  4.33  4.67  4.54 4.83  4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5   0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67   84/  90  3.67  4.49  4.50 4.69  3.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67   81/  92  3.67  4.39  4.38 4.64  3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 5   0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00   79/  93  3.00  4.03  4.06 4.32  3.00


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1  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  5.00  ****/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
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              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       B    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 significant
                                        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                          Fall   2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires: 10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  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  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   0   9  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/1287   **** 4.28  4.30 4.38  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  1   7  4.88  111/1459   4.88 4.22  4.22 4.32  4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  2   8  4.80  151/1489   4.80 3.90  4.17 4.18  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  8   2  4.20 1300/1506   4.20 4.52  4.67 4.67  4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  0  2   5  4.71  177/1463   4.71 4.00  4.09 4.18  4.71


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0  2   6  4.75  447/1438   4.75 4.27  4.46 4.50  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0   8  5.00    1/1421   5.00 4.68  4.73 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  1   6  4.86  190/1411   4.86 4.24  4.31 4.35  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  1  1   6  4.63  513/1405   4.63 4.18  4.32 4.34  4.63


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  0   8  5.00    1/1260   5.00 4.21  4.14 4.25  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1   6  4.86  246/1255   4.86 4.40  4.33 4.46  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0  0  0   7  5.00    1/1258   5.00 4.54  4.38 4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   2  0  0  0  1   4  4.80   93/ 873   4.80 3.89  4.03 4.26  4.80


                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENGL 493  1                        University of Maryland                                    Page  727
Title      Seminar In CT                               Baltimore County                                  MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:   Burgess,Helen J                           Fall   2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  12                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   143/1509   4.92 4.05 4.31 4.39  4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58   447/1509   4.58 4.13 4.26 4.26  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  0  3  6  4.67   359/1287   4.67 4.28 4.30 4.38  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   3  0  0  1  0  8  4.78   173/1459   4.78 4.22 4.22 4.32  4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75   164/1406   4.75 4.04 4.09 4.11  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75   149/1384   4.75 4.27 4.11 4.23  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42   583/1489   4.42 3.90 4.17 4.18  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0  0  0  0 12  0  4.00  1383/1506   4.00 4.52 4.67 4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75   151/1463   4.75 4.00 4.09 4.18  4.75


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          3   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67   588/1438   4.67 4.27 4.46 4.50  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     3   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1421   5.00 4.68 4.73 4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  3   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67   416/1411   4.67 4.24 4.31 4.35  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       3   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67   459/1405   4.67 4.18 4.32 4.34  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3   6  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   421/1236   4.33 3.76 4.00 4.03  4.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  1  1 10  4.75   244/1260   4.75 4.21 4.14 4.25  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67   443/1255   4.67 4.40 4.33 4.46  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   212/1258   4.92 4.54 4.38 4.51  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                    0   8  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/ 873   5.00 3.89 4.03 4.26  5.00


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  8   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/  89   5.00 4.62 4.49 4.71  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/  92   5.00 4.67 4.54 4.83  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  9   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/  90   5.00 4.49 4.50 4.69  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      9   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/  92   5.00 4.39 4.38 4.64  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  9   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67    24/  93   4.67 4.03 4.06 4.32  4.67


                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0      A    3      Required for Majors  12    Graduate     0      Major        12
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0      B    8
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    1      C    0      General              0     Under-grad  12      Non-major     0
  84-150    9        3.00-3.49    6      D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    3      F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                0
                                         ?    0
```