

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1214/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1302/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	564/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	1196/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	1	4	3.31	1300/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	692/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	1	5	3.38	1362/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1473/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1046/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	6	1	4	3.46	1368/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	3.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1268/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1152/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1222/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	902/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.80
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1148/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1257/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	507/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	5.00	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/74	4.90	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	4.56	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	4.38	4.42	3.94	3.82	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Burns,Margie

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	10	5	4.06	1109/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	979/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1053/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	832/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	657/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	396/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	8	1	3.56	1302/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	864/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.07
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1037/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1019/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	727/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	886/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1139/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.27
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	620/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	926/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	724/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	719/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Burns,Margie

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	5.00	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	4.90	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	4.56	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	4.38	4.42	3.94	3.82	****

### 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 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 10	Under-grad 17 Non-major 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harvey,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	578/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	147/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	313/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	446/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	377/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	340/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	968/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	344/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	221/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	516/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	364/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	667/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	728/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	334/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	290/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.38

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harvey,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 13	Under-grad 18 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	8	5	3.83	1265/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	6	4.00	1113/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	898/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	682/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	788/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	501/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	808/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1386/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	464/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	1005/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1127/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	757/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	800/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	3	4	7	3.88	855/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.88
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	334/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	531/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	370/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	335/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.31

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	5.00	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	4.90	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	4.56	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	4.38	4.42	3.94	3.82	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		
			Other 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harvey,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	6	4	3.71	1333/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	623/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	393/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	772/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	985/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	658/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	845/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	1101/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	675/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	637/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	361/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	683/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	815/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	4	2	2	2	3.00	1194/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	701/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	523/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	577/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	659/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harvey,Jonathan

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 8 Required for Majors	2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 17 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	3	7	2	3.00	1485/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	7	4	4	3.26	1448/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	810/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	6	4	3.55	1349/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	6	4	3	2.90	1398/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	2.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	0	9	4	3.35	1279/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	2	10	3.90	1136/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1362/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	3	1	5	5	3	3.24	1366/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	3.24
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1202/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	516/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1207/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1333/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1093/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	780/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	879/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	1138/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	564/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.88

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 2	A 5 Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 5 General 15	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0 Electives 0 P 0 I 0 Other 0 ? 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Carillo,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	7	6	6	3.55	1395/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	7	8	3.82	1273/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1157/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	1006/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	718/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	786/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	6	4	4	4	3.10	1412/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1178/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	767/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.18
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	8	6	3.86	1280/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	1102/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1160/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	1013/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	2	1	2	3	3.20	1160/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	4	3	8	3.88	880/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	685/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	2	11	4.18	872/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	430/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Carillo,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	2.88	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	3.13	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	4.33	4.33	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	18	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	15	4	3.88	1247/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	656/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	695/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	5	11	4.04	829/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	865/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	14	4.29	734/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	283/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	305/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.55
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	403/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	464/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	529/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	17	4.46	741/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	5	7	8	3.83	888/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	570/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	591/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	23	4.88	268/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	8	14	4.48	234/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.48

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 08	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    8	0.00-0.99    2	A            2	Required for Majors            4	Graduate            0	Major            0
28-55    0	1.00-1.99    0	B            14			
56-83    1	2.00-2.99    0	C            6	General            18	Under-grad            24	Non-major            24
84-150    0	3.00-3.49    2	D            1			
Grad.    0	3.50-4.00    1	F            0	Electives            0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P            0			
		I            0	Other            0		
		?            1			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	1	7	11	4.04	1115/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	280/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	294/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	419/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	5	10	3	3.55	1190/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	258/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	489/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	12	6	4.14	800/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.14
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	782/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	645/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	378/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	435/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	584/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.19
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	8	4.10	750/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	799/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	1	7	9	4.11	909/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	419/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/208	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	4.56	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	4.38	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/42	2.88	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/41	3.13	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	3.83	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/43	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	4.33	4.33	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    6	0.00-0.99    1	A    11	Required for Majors    1	Graduate    0	Major    0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 09	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 24
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Killgallon,Dona		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	3		1.00-1.99	0	B									
56-83	0		2.00-2.99	0	C			19	General	Under-grad	23		Non-major	23
84-150	0		3.00-3.49	1	D									
Grad.	0		3.50-4.00	1	F			1	Electives					
					P									
					I									
					?			0	Other					

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	12	3	3.77	1295/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	7	4.14	1016/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	972/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	6	4	3.53	1203/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	692/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	9	4	6	3.59	1295/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1344/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	13	7	4.23	710/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	553/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	839/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	541/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	908/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	782/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.95
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	12	6	4.20	669/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	548/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	562/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	442/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.11

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	5.00	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	2.88	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	3.13	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.68	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	22	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

?      0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	11	7	3.96	1186/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	453/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	369/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	6	6	4	3.67	1126/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	339/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	722/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	3	4.13	1374/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	651/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	997/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	886/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	577/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	846/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	11	7	4.20	574/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	768/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	675/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	345/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	2	4	3	10	4.11	442/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.11

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	9	A	16	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	19	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	12	5	3.88	1247/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	862/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	640/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	530/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	501/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	4	14	4.21	845/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	542/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.37
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	403/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	258/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	420/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	622/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	6	7	6	3.81	902/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.81
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	476/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	320/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	323/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	2	10	10	4.26	355/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.26

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	20	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 14
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	9	6	4.00	1140/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	11	6	4.15	998/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	769/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	14	4	4.10	1002/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	1055/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	489/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	746/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	283/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	12	3	4.13	822/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.13
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	735/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	742/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	785/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	3	3	6	3	3.29	1129/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	669/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	735/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	118/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	3	10	3	3.72	629/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.72

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 14
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	16	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	908/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	410/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	564/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	470/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	541/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	232/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	8	9	4.26	771/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	839/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	911/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	604/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1019/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	463/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	589/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	594/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.18
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	421/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	565/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	507/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	582/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.83

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	183/208	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.23	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/76	5.00	4.75	4.51	4.44	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	13/74	4.90	4.93	4.31	4.43	4.90
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	26/66	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.15	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	32/76	4.56	4.69	4.27	4.21	4.56
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	2	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	26/73	4.38	4.42	3.94	3.82	4.38
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	34/42	2.88	2.88	4.00	4.08	2.88
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	34/41	3.13	3.13	4.06	4.10	3.13
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	25/32	3.83	3.83	4.20	4.09	3.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	11/29	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.87	4.60
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	22/43	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.68	4.71
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.51	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	22/36	4.33	4.33	4.43	4.33	4.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 16
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	10	10	4.08	1090/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	14	4.33	818/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	634/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	15	4.33	746/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	433/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	10	13	4.46	454/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	734/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	509/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	698/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.24
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	534/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	964/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	420/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	320/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	3	1	2	2	4	3.25	1143/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	334/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	370/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	467/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 16
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	4.90	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	4.56	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	4.38	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	3.13	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	3.83	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	4.33	4.33	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    6	0.00-0.99    3	A    17	Required for Majors    4	Graduate    0	Major    0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 16		Term - Fall 2010					Enrollment: 24									
Title: Composition							Questionnaires: 24									
Instructor: Kidd, Kathleen A																
Questions		NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced																
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5											
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General			17	Under-grad	24	Non-major				24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0											
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0											
				I	0	Other			0							
				?	2											

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 17
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Goodwin,David C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	1078/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	14	4.47	623/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	704/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	496/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	851/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	489/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	2	5	8	4.00	1050/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1362/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	579/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	7	8	4.17	1138/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1078/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	812/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	589/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	405/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	538/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	685/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	659/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 17
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Goodwin,David C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 18
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Goodwin,David C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	4	4	3.35	1443/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	771/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	943/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	796/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	8	3	3.65	1135/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	9	6	4.12	816/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	959/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	14	1	3.88	1488/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	555/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.36
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	854/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1183/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	625/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	981/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	2	1	11	4.19	594/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.19
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	319/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	897/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	312/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	659/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 18
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Goodwin,David C

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	14	2	3.86	1256/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	2	13	4.19	961/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	912/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	753/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	348/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1136/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	283/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	845/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.11
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	385/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	258/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	698/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	741/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1053/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.53
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	598/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	494/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	279/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	234/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.47

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	3.75	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	5.00	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	4.90	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	4.50	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	4.56	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	4.38	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	2.88	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	3.13	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	3.83	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	4.60	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	4.33	4.33	4.43	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	8	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 20
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Maher, Jennifer

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	687/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	818/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	286/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	573/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	329/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1370/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	3.67	1505/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	911/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	1072/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	839/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1207/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	922/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	4	0	2	2	2.64	1249/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	2.64
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	701/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	643/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	607/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	906/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	2.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 20
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Maher, Jennifer

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 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 2 General	11	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 21
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	7	10	4.10	1084/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	12	4.48	623/1527	4.28	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1333	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	576/1495	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	718/1439	3.96	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	431/1425	4.35	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	857/1508	4.01	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	566/1526	4.50	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	651/1490	4.18	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	319/1428	4.47	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	548/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	541/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	711/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	0	10	3	3.87	862/1291	3.69	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.87
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	357/1271	4.28	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	494/1276	4.38	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	188/1273	4.65	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	297/922	3.95	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.36

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 21
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors	4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1 General	13	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	521/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	639/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	294/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	624/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	146/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	266/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	921/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	8	6	1	3.53	1511/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	3.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	118/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	735/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	361/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	420/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	208/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	875/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.85
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	357/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	494/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	188/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	0	4	2	2	3.00	857/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 8 Required for Majors	4 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0 General	9	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	3	13	4.35	815/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	453/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	620/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	496/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	314/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	736/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	613/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	16	3	4.05	1409/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	328/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	854/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	310/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	541/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	667/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	5	3	4	4	3.29	1129/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	693/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	212/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	691/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.60

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/198	3.50	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/208	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	4.78	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/194	4.60	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	4.30	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    4	0.00-0.99    2	A    6	Required for Majors    7	Graduate    0	Major    0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 04		Term - Fall 2010					Enrollment: 25									
Title: Composition							Questionnaires: 21									
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian																
Questions		NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced																
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11											
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General			14	Under-grad	21		Non-major			21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0											
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0											
				I	0	Other			0							
				?	0											

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	0	3	7	3	3.17	1470/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	2	4	6	3.39	1427/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	2	2	3	3	3.25	1288/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	1	8	4	3.39	1399/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	3.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	0	2	4	6	3.50	1216/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	0	6	8	3.94	942/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	1333/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	1	4	3	2	3.00	1406/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	2	1	3	8	3.65	1338/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	3.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	1329/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	4	3	6	3.47	1308/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	2	4	5	3.44	1320/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	3	2	0	2	2	2.78	1239/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	2.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	4	1	1	4	2.79	1228/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	5	3	3	0	2.43	1261/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	2.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	0	3	4	2	2.86	1249/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	811/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 3 Required for Majors	4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 4 General	9	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	865/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	514/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	564/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	227/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	222/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	329/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	640/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	13	2	3.89	1487/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	3.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	281/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	653/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	516/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	364/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	489/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	7	4	4	3.50	1061/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	612/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	417/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	141/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	2	6	4	4	3.47	737/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.47

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	188/198	3.50	3.50	4.16	3.90	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/208	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/194	4.78	4.78	4.56	4.54	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	67/194	4.60	4.60	4.37	4.30	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	42/176	4.30	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.60
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	973/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	795/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	432/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	7	5	3.78	1046/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	232/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	4	12	4.20	845/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1322/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	449/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	920/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	886/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	625/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	870/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	728/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/198	3.50	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/208	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	4.78	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	4.60	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	4.30	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 16
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	973/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	656/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	769/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	369/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	918/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	563/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	517/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	1	1	9	6	4.18	767/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.18
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	735/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	917/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	772/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	815/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	7	5	6	3.75	937/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	3	9	3.94	832/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	824/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	947/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	2	1	5	5	3.44	761/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.44

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 16
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	3.50	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	4.78	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	4.60	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/176	4.30	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 16
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1 A 8	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	18 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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Porter,Jane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	12	6	3.96	1186/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	326/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1087/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	608/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	851/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	10	4.23	703/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	758/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	783/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	221/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	770/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	886/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	350/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	815/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	679/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.10
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	709/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	643/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	471/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	659/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Porter,Jane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 2	A 12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 18	Under-grad 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	700/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	575/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	489/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	657/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	2	10	3.95	907/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	215/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	4	4	7	3.45	1337/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1112/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	911/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	422/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	839/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	950/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	846/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	916/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.79
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	693/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	780/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	761/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	449/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.08

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	3.50	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	4.78	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	4.60	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	4.30	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	9	6	4.25	919/1528	4.16	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	575/1527	4.39	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1003/1333	4.22	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	695/1495	4.38	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	594/1439	4.17	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	603/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	8	5	4.00	1050/1508	4.08	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	618/1526	4.42	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	639/1490	4.28	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	270/1428	4.52	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	1019/1436	4.76	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	553/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	770/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	5	2	0	2.89	1227/1291	3.55	3.61	4.05	3.97	2.89
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	598/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	696/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	345/1273	4.45	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	467/922	3.57	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	138/198	3.50	3.50	4.16	3.90	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	68/208	4.65	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	76/194	4.78	4.78	4.56	4.54	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/194	4.60	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	126/176	4.30	4.30	4.23	4.19	4.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100H 01
Title:	Composition - Honors
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	434/1528	4.67	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	538/1527	4.53	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1333	****	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	647/1439	4.27	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	106/1425	4.87	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1293/1508	3.60	3.91	4.18	4.11	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	156/1490	4.75	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	553/1428	4.71	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	350/1427	4.71	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.20	4.34	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	3.97	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	381/1271	4.58	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	268/1276	4.83	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	99/922	4.82	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.82

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100H 01
Title:	Composition - Honors
Instructor:	McCarthy, Lucill

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	15

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General 5	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives 0 P 0 I 0 Other 0 ? 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100P 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1025/1528	4.15	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	704/1527	4.43	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	721/1495	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	635/1425	4.29	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	908/1508	4.15	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	769/1526	4.79	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	911/1490	4.00	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	303/1428	4.86	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	980/1436	4.71	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	541/1427	4.57	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1239/1425	3.71	4.20	4.34	4.31	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	614/1291	4.17	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	644/1271	4.25	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	348/1276	4.75	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	345/922	4.29	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.29
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	58/76	4.25	4.75	4.51	4.44	4.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100P 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	15/74	4.88	4.93	4.31	4.43	4.88
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	23/66	4.63	4.56	4.27	4.15	4.63
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	34/76	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.21	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	50/73	3.88	4.42	3.94	3.82	3.88

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 12	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
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 responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	8	5	3.59	1380/1528	3.66	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	10	5	3.77	1296/1527	3.73	4.15	4.28	4.23	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1116/1333	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.26	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	867/1495	3.94	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	5	4	4	3.15	1340/1439	3.45	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	8	5	7	3.77	1075/1425	3.87	4.24	4.12	3.93	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	758/1508	3.69	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	3	4.14	1374/1526	4.52	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	14	2	3.82	1110/1490	3.70	4.02	4.11	4.02	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1163/1428	4.11	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1090/1436	4.72	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1024/1427	3.98	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1076/1425	3.75	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1291	3.75	3.61	4.05	3.97	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1135/1271	3.53	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1026/1276	3.91	4.37	4.33	4.14	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1168/1273	4.00	4.47	4.38	4.18	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/922	3.97	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.17

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	19	Under-grad	22	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 responses



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	11	2	3.36	1441/1528	3.66	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	9	2	3	2.90	1496/1527	3.73	4.15	4.28	4.23	2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1333	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	2	7	6	3	3.19	1437/1495	3.94	4.23	4.25	4.11	3.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	6	3	4	2	2.78	1407/1439	3.45	3.99	4.11	3.97	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	3	7	5	3.36	1275/1425	3.87	4.24	4.12	3.93	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	8	4	7	2	0	2.14	1495/1508	3.69	3.91	4.18	4.11	2.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	636/1526	4.52	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	7	5	2	3.17	1383/1490	3.70	4.02	4.11	4.02	3.17
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	1360/1428	4.11	4.33	4.49	4.43	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	580/1436	4.72	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	6	1	7	2	3.18	1359/1427	3.98	4.23	4.32	4.27	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	5	5	4	1	2.72	1394/1425	3.75	4.20	4.34	4.31	2.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	3	1	5	5	4	3.33	1116/1291	3.75	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1190/1271	3.53	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1012/1276	3.91	4.37	4.33	4.14	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	893/1273	4.00	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	582/922	3.97	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.83

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	25									
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires:	22									
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi												
		Frequencies	Instructor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced													

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	15	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	9	5	3.80	1280/1528	3.66	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	12	5	4.00	1113/1527	3.73	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	564/1333	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	3	4	9	4.00	1047/1495	3.94	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	1	8	6	3.84	997/1439	3.45	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	776/1425	3.87	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	6	10	4.15	908/1508	3.69	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1526	4.52	4.54	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1110/1490	3.70	4.02	4.11	4.02	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	1021/1428	4.11	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	948/1436	4.72	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	863/1427	3.98	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	1060/1425	3.75	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	965/1291	3.75	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.71
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	832/1271	3.53	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	0	4	10	4.00	926/1276	3.91	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	816/1273	4.00	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	452/922	3.97	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.06

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Hickernell, Mary

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Hickernell, Mary

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2 A 5	Required for Majors	4 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 5	General	8 Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	5	10	3.90	1233/1528	3.66	4.02	4.31	4.16	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	922/1527	3.73	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	634/1333	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	746/1495	3.94	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	3	10	4.05	824/1439	3.45	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	736/1425	3.87	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	845/1508	3.69	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	15	4	4.10	1395/1526	4.52	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	911/1490	3.70	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	909/1428	4.11	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	1055/1436	4.72	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	874/1427	3.98	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	958/1425	3.75	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	567/1291	3.75	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.21
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	955/1271	3.53	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	980/1276	3.91	4.37	4.33	4.14	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	920/1273	4.00	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	582/922	3.97	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.83

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 07	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Walters, April I				

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 4	A 7 Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1 General 11	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0 Electives 0 P 0 I 0 Other 0 ? 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01
Title:	Composition ESL Students
Instructor:	Rollins,John V

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	700/1528	4.62	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	783/1527	4.60	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	880/1333	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1002/1495	4.42	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	963/1439	4.40	3.99	4.11	3.97	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	891/1425	4.36	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	448/1508	4.57	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	724/1526	4.65	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1149/1490	4.25	4.02	4.11	4.02	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1328/1428	4.30	4.33	4.49	4.43	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	1260/1436	4.54	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	874/1427	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	1045/1425	4.42	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	1013/1291	3.88	3.61	4.05	3.97	3.63
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1027/1271	4.08	4.12	4.16	3.98	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1119/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1083/1273	4.24	4.47	4.38	4.18	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	680/922	4.06	3.89	4.02	3.87	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01
Title:	Composition ESL Students
Instructor:	Rollins,John V

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.19	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	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	1	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 04
Title:	Composition ESL Students
Instructor:	Follett,Sonja

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	265/1528	4.62	4.02	4.31	4.16	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	170/1527	4.60	4.15	4.28	4.23	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1333	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	247/1495	4.42	4.23	4.25	4.11	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	105/1439	4.40	3.99	4.11	3.97	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	199/1425	4.36	4.24	4.12	3.93	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	318/1508	4.57	3.91	4.18	4.11	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1091/1526	4.65	4.54	4.66	4.57	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	156/1490	4.25	4.02	4.11	4.02	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	237/1428	4.30	4.33	4.49	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1019/1436	4.54	4.73	4.74	4.70	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	156/1427	4.59	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	378/1425	4.42	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	634/1291	3.88	3.61	4.05	3.97	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	421/1271	4.08	4.12	4.16	3.98	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	234/1276	4.25	4.37	4.33	4.14	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	433/1273	4.24	4.47	4.38	4.18	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	218/922	4.06	3.89	4.02	3.87	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 04
Title:	Composition ESL Students
Instructor:	Follett,Sonja

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.19	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.82	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.87	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	4.33	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 04
Title:	Composition ESL Students
Instructor:	Follett, Sonja

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 01
Title:	Introduction To Lit
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	11	31	4.53	601/1528	4.53	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	36	4.70	312/1527	4.70	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	39	4.74	305/1333	4.74	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	8	33	4.59	394/1495	4.59	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	36	4.70	205/1439	4.70	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	7	7	29	4.38	543/1425	4.38	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	9	33	4.59	371/1508	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	9	31	7	3.96	1454/1526	3.96	4.54	4.66	4.64	3.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	14	25	4.60	266/1490	4.60	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	40	4.83	352/1428	4.83	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	41	4.89	548/1436	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	174/1427	4.87	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	7	37	4.74	378/1425	4.74	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	1	11	28	4.55	297/1291	4.55	3.61	4.05	4.14	4.55
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	669/1271	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	562/1273	4.60	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	29	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	355/922	4.26	3.89	4.02	4.11	4.26

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 01
Title:	Introduction To Lit
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.15	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	3.75	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	35	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	48	Non-major	45
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	10						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01
Title:	English Grammar Usage
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	8	10	7	3.85	1261/1528	3.85	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	853/1527	4.31	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	713/1333	4.39	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	12	9	4.16	942/1495	4.16	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	6	4	10	3.75	1064/1439	3.75	3.99	4.11	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	10	10	4.08	845/1425	4.08	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	5	5	5	10	3.80	1207/1508	3.80	3.91	4.18	4.19	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	3	7	10	3	3.46	1513/1526	3.46	4.54	4.66	4.64	3.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	11	7	4.14	811/1490	4.14	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.14
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	7	6	12	4.20	1114/1428	4.20	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	839/1436	4.81	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	5	4	15	4.32	853/1427	4.32	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	16	4.35	862/1425	4.35	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1093/1291	3.40	3.61	4.05	4.14	3.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1271	****	4.12	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1276	****	4.37	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1273	****	4.47	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/922	****	3.89	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01
Title:	English Grammar Usage
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	28

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	28	Non-major	21
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 01
Title:	Currents In British Lit
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	15	4.42	752/1528	4.42	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	6	11	4.00	1113/1527	4.00	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	12	4.17	898/1333	4.17	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	6	11	4.14	972/1495	4.14	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	367/1439	4.50	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	9	12	4.29	624/1425	4.29	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	895/1508	4.17	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	22	0	3.91	1480/1526	3.91	4.54	4.66	4.64	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	698/1490	4.24	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.24
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	909/1428	4.46	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	612/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	757/1427	4.42	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	19	4.46	741/1425	4.46	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	0	6	7	4	3.58	1035/1291	3.58	3.61	4.05	4.14	3.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	620/1271	4.30	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	2	14	4.35	735/1276	4.35	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	799/1273	4.30	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	5	6	3	3.56	702/922	3.56	3.89	4.02	4.11	3.56

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 01
Title:	Currents In British Lit
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	24

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01
Title:	Currents In American Lit
Instructor:	Malecki,Asynith

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	506/1528	4.48	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	237/1527	4.54	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	147/1333	4.76	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	124/1495	4.65	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	108/1439	4.84	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	24	4.71	215/1425	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	24	4.68	272/1508	4.60	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	15	4.48	1081/1526	4.28	4.54	4.66	4.64	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	33/1490	4.65	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.96
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	497/1428	4.64	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1436	4.99	4.73	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	165/1427	4.76	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	197/1425	4.75	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	10	6	7	3.79	909/1291	4.02	3.61	4.05	4.14	3.79
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	191/1271	4.63	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	279/1276	4.73	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	118/1273	4.94	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	193/922	4.57	3.89	4.02	4.11	4.57

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01
Title:	Currents In American Lit
Instructor:	Malecki,Asynith

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.18	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	3.85	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0 A 17	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 3	General	11	Under-grad	31	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 02
Title:	Currents In American Lit
Instructor:	Blumberg,Arnold

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	15	18	4.35	815/1528	4.48	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	12	18	4.30	862/1527	4.54	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	436/1333	4.76	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	6	7	20	4.42	624/1495	4.65	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	31	4.81	128/1439	4.84	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	7	23	4.30	624/1425	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	428/1508	4.60	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	23	8	4.08	1398/1526	4.28	4.54	4.66	4.64	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	15	14	4.34	567/1490	4.65	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.34
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	11	22	4.54	806/1428	4.64	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	155/1436	4.99	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	435/1427	4.76	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	5	26	4.63	529/1425	4.75	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	6	6	19	4.24	546/1291	4.02	3.61	4.05	4.14	4.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	507/1271	4.63	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	461/1276	4.73	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	188/1273	4.94	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	****/922	4.57	3.89	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 02
Title:	Currents In American Lit
Instructor:	Blumberg,Arnold

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.18	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.95	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	3.75	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 02
Title:	Currents In American Lit
Instructor:	Blumberg,Arnold

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 19	Required for Majors	5 Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 13		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	14 Under-grad 37 Non-major 31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	13
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 4		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	463/1528	4.64	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	396/1527	4.64	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	500/1333	4.56	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	445/1495	4.54	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	132/1439	4.80	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	19	4.60	301/1425	4.60	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	428/1508	4.52	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	16	6	4.22	1322/1526	4.22	4.54	4.66	4.64	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	13	9	4.35	567/1490	4.35	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	385/1428	4.80	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	258/1436	4.95	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	506/1427	4.60	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	349/1425	4.75	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	2	0	4	4	5	3.67	993/1291	3.67	3.61	4.05	4.14	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	229/1271	4.78	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1276	4.56	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1273	4.78	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.89	4.02	4.11	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.95	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.32	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	3.75	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	35
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare		Questionnaires:	26
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		2		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0										
				I	0	Other		0							
				?	7										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction
Instructor:	Linder,Deborah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	805/1528	4.37	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	410/1527	4.63	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	237/1333	4.80	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	359/1495	4.61	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	239/1439	4.67	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	199/1425	4.72	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	448/1508	4.50	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	198/1490	4.69	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	669/1428	4.65	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	774/1436	4.82	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	364/1427	4.71	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	644/1425	4.53	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.14	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.12	4.16	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.89	4.02	4.11	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction
Instructor:	Linder,Deborah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.18	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	3.95	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	3.75	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction
Instructor:	Linder,Deborah

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P	0						
			I	0	Other	1				
			?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	0	2	7	1	3.07	1480/1528	3.07	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	6	1	0	2.36	1518/1527	2.36	4.15	4.28	4.32	2.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1433/1495	3.22	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	7	3	0	3.09	1352/1439	3.09	3.99	4.11	4.12	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1193/1425	3.55	4.24	4.12	4.11	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	7	2	2	0	0	1.55	1507/1508	1.55	3.91	4.18	4.19	1.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	8	0	3.62	1509/1526	3.62	4.54	4.66	4.64	3.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1383/1490	3.17	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.17
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	6	2	3	0	2	2.23	1423/1428	2.23	4.33	4.49	4.48	2.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	1102/1436	4.62	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	7	1	1	2.69	1400/1427	2.69	4.23	4.32	4.33	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	1	4	3.15	1361/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.15
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	2	0	4	3.10	1188/1271	3.10	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	3	0	2	3	3.10	1223/1276	3.10	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	799/1273	4.30	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/922	****	3.89	4.02	4.11	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
			Required for Majors	5	Graduate
				0	Major
					5

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

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

Discussion															
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5										
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		3	Under-grad	14	Non-major				9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0										
				I	0	Other		2							
				?	2										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	348/1528	4.77	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	438/1527	4.69	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1333	4.63	4.29	4.34	4.40	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	139/1495	4.82	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	1	6	9	4.22	689/1439	4.48	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	18	4.67	249/1425	4.74	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	832/1508	4.27	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.67	4.54	4.66	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	389/1490	4.66	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	887/1428	4.75	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	901/1436	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	757/1427	4.58	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	800/1425	4.58	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1291	4.07	3.61	4.05	4.14	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	98/1271	4.85	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	234/1276	4.87	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1273	4.88	4.47	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	141/922	4.75	3.89	4.02	4.11	4.71

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 291 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Intro Wrtg Creat Essays		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Wilkinson,Rache		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 1 General 3	Under-grad 22	Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives 2 P 0 I 0 Other 2 ? 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Sawyers,Seth A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	96/1528	4.77	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	290/1527	4.69	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1333	4.63	4.29	4.34	4.40	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	117/1495	4.82	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	283/1439	4.48	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	52/1425	4.74	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	1050/1508	4.27	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	4.67	4.54	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1490	4.66	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	133/1428	4.75	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1436	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	420/1427	4.58	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	242/1425	4.58	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	993/1291	4.07	3.61	4.05	4.14	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1271	4.85	4.12	4.16	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1276	4.87	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	382/1273	4.88	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	124/922	4.75	3.89	4.02	4.11	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Sawyers,Seth A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.15	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.68	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	3.75	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	448/1528	4.77	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	280/1527	4.69	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	436/1333	4.63	4.29	4.34	4.40	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	247/1495	4.82	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	283/1439	4.48	3.99	4.11	4.12	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	292/1425	4.74	4.24	4.12	4.11	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	371/1508	4.27	3.91	4.18	4.19	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	4.67	4.54	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	281/1490	4.66	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	17	4.83	335/1428	4.75	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	964/1436	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.76	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	420/1427	4.58	4.23	4.32	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	667/1425	4.58	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	356/1291	4.07	3.61	4.05	4.14	4.47
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	349/1271	4.85	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	348/1276	4.87	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	102/922	4.75	3.89	4.02	4.11	4.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 01
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	230/1528	4.82	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	783/1527	4.36	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	564/1333	4.50	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	708/1495	4.36	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	433/1439	4.45	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	454/1425	4.45	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	640/1508	4.36	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	221/1490	4.67	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	806/1428	4.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	516/1436	4.91	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1044/1427	4.09	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	981/1425	4.18	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	902/1291	3.80	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.80
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.12	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	385/1276	4.71	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1273	4.71	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	659/922	3.67	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 01
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 300 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Comm/Tech - Analysis		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Shipka, Jody L.		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	674/1528	4.50	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	550/1527	4.68	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1333	4.71	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	496/1495	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	205/1439	4.69	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	320/1425	4.60	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	7	2	5	3.53	1312/1508	4.10	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	4.00	1421/1526	4.27	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	2	8	3	3.67	1203/1490	4.19	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	368/1428	4.76	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1436	4.93	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	727/1427	4.63	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	529/1425	4.72	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	1153/1291	3.27	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.22
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	365/1271	4.53	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	890/1276	4.54	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	909/1273	4.55	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	799/922	3.76	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4 Required for Majors	12	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 5 General	1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 02
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	865/1528	4.50	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	259/1527	4.68	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	316/1333	4.71	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	407/1495	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	248/1439	4.69	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	329/1425	4.60	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	586/1508	4.10	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	15	2	3.95	1454/1526	4.27	4.54	4.66	4.68	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	434/1490	4.19	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	515/1428	4.76	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	580/1436	4.93	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	323/1427	4.63	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	515/1425	4.72	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	1251/1291	3.27	3.61	4.05	4.09	2.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	421/1271	4.53	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	257/1276	4.54	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	395/1273	4.55	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	680/922	3.76	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.63

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 02
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8 Required for Majors	14	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 1 General	3	Under-grad 20 Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 1 Other	0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 03
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	348/1528	4.50	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	237/1527	4.68	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	372/1333	4.71	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	496/1495	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	190/1439	4.69	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	275/1425	4.60	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	640/1508	4.10	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	654/1526	4.27	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	404/1490	4.19	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	534/1428	4.76	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	516/1436	4.93	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	337/1427	4.63	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	163/1425	4.72	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	728/1291	3.27	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	507/1271	4.53	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	439/1276	4.54	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	382/1273	4.55	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	328/922	3.76	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.31

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 301 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Analysis Literary Lang		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: McKinley, Kathry		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.26	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01
Title:	Art Of The Essay
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	815/1528	4.35	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	862/1527	4.29	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1333	****	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	457/1495	4.53	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	485/1439	4.41	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	1152/1526	4.41	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	663/1490	4.27	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	1037/1428	4.31	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	774/1436	4.82	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	757/1427	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	711/1425	4.47	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	528/1271	4.43	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	565/1276	4.53	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	345/1273	4.80	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/922	****	3.89	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01
Title:	Art Of The Essay
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	7	13	4.25	919/1528	4.25	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	8	7	3.71	1338/1527	3.71	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	12	4.08	962/1333	4.08	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	11	6	3.83	1202/1495	3.83	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	5	13	4.27	636/1439	4.27	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	2	9	6	3.73	1108/1425	3.73	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	5	7	5	3.41	1358/1508	3.41	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	853/1526	4.73	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	12	4	4.06	878/1490	4.06	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.06
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	4	10	5	3.73	1322/1428	3.73	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	948/1436	4.74	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	7	7	3.86	1183/1427	3.86	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	3	14	4.27	915/1425	4.27	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1231/1291	2.86	3.61	4.05	4.09	2.86
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	765/1271	4.06	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	7	5	6	3.94	966/1276	3.94	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	903/1273	4.11	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/922	****	3.89	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	7

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 304 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 32
Title: Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Falco,Raphael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		1						
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 305 01
Title:	Brit Lit:Restor - Romant
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	20	4.47	687/1528	4.47	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	10	15	4.34	806/1527	4.34	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	20	4.57	500/1333	4.57	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	369/1495	4.61	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	7	22	4.67	239/1439	4.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	275/1425	4.63	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	261/1508	4.69	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	24	5	4.13	1374/1526	4.13	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	15	9	4.22	710/1490	4.22	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.22
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	637/1428	4.67	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	580/1436	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	613/1427	4.52	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	475/1425	4.67	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	20	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	304/1271	4.68	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	472/1276	4.64	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	334/1273	4.82	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	370/922	4.23	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.23

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 305 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 34
Title: Brit Lit:Restor - Romant		Questionnaires: 30
Instructor: Smith,Orianne M		

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    0	0.00-0.99    1	A            8	Required for Majors    21	Graduate            0	Major                16
28-55    2	1.00-1.99    0	B            14			
56-83    5	2.00-2.99    4	C            1	General                0	Under-grad            30	Non-major            14
84-150    2	3.00-3.49    6	D            0			
Grad.    0	3.50-4.00    4	F            0	Electives                2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P            0			
		I            0	Other                    0		
		?            6			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 306 01
Title:	Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	11	8	3.92	1214/1528	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	10	4.00	1113/1527	4.00	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	15	8	4.12	943/1333	4.12	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	6	8	7	3.87	1180/1495	3.87	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	314/1439	4.58	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	6	9	7	3.73	1101/1425	3.73	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	5	10	3.81	1207/1508	3.81	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	9	4.35	1208/1526	4.35	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	3	6	5	5	3.63	1221/1490	3.63	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	1013/1428	4.35	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	774/1436	4.83	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	983/1427	4.17	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	9	10	4.17	989/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	5	5	5	3.61	1032/1271	3.61	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	908/1276	4.06	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	6	6	0	6	3.33	1201/1273	3.33	4.47	4.38	4.40	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	15	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/922	****	3.89	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 306 01
Title:	Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	26

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 307 01
Title:	Am Lit To Civil War
Instructor:	Doulos,Alyson E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	20	4.57	567/1528	4.57	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	410/1527	4.63	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	830/1333	4.25	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	8	21	4.60	369/1495	4.60	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	265/1439	4.63	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	513/1425	4.40	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	10	16	4.37	640/1508	4.37	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	4.47	1101/1526	4.47	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	15	7	4.04	891/1490	4.04	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.04
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	352/1428	4.82	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	207/1436	4.96	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	406/1427	4.68	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	6	21	4.64	502/1425	4.64	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	6	12	5	3.83	882/1291	3.83	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	9	13	4.38	570/1271	4.38	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	750/1276	4.33	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	3	6	7	7	3.78	604/922	3.78	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.78

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 307 01
Title:	Am Lit To Civil War
Instructor:	Doulos,Alyson E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	30	Non-major	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	2	9	4.18	1004/1528	4.18	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	795/1527	4.35	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	458/1333	4.60	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	544/1495	4.47	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	257/1439	4.65	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	624/1425	4.29	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	489/1508	4.47	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	778/1490	4.17	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.17
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	478/1428	4.75	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	806/1436	4.81	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	727/1427	4.44	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	770/1425	4.44	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	6	6	2	3.71	965/1291	3.71	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.71
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	381/1271	4.58	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	439/1276	4.67	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	408/1273	4.75	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	675/922	3.64	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.64

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	18

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 01
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Maher, Jennifer

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	506/1528	4.52	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	656/1527	4.46	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	458/1333	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	496/1495	4.51	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	573/1439	4.40	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	583/1425	4.51	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	6	8	3.86	1171/1508	4.24	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	7	8	4	2	3.05	1519/1526	3.80	4.54	4.66	4.68	3.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	542/1490	4.26	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.37
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	385/1428	4.85	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	258/1436	4.92	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	435/1427	4.74	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	277/1425	4.85	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	189/1291	4.48	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1271	4.83	4.12	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	190/1276	4.82	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1273	4.90	4.47	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	272/922	4.26	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 01
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Maher, Jennifer

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	739/1528	4.52	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	623/1527	4.46	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	741/1333	4.48	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	470/1495	4.51	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	406/1439	4.40	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	232/1425	4.51	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	318/1508	4.24	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1019/1526	3.80	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	789/1490	4.26	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.15
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	237/1428	4.85	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	548/1436	4.92	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	202/1427	4.74	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	174/1425	4.85	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	518/1291	4.48	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	319/1271	4.83	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	367/1276	4.82	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	345/1273	4.90	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	436/922	4.26	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.11

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.33	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01
Title:	Structure Of English
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	5	5	9	3.46	1418/1528	3.46	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	0	5	6	10	3.62	1369/1527	3.62	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	4	16	4.19	871/1333	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	2	7	4	5	3.29	1421/1495	3.29	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	3	6	5	6	3.16	1338/1439	3.16	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	3	5	4	7	3.12	1333/1425	3.12	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	4	3	14	3.85	1178/1508	3.85	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	968/1526	4.62	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	5	1	7	8	2	3.04	1402/1490	3.04	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.04
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	0	8	12	3.88	1270/1428	3.88	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	5	18	4.46	1213/1436	4.46	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	4	7	9	3.62	1276/1427	3.62	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	0	5	13	3.69	1246/1425	3.69	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	5	4	7	3.26	1153/1271	3.26	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	0	1	6	11	3.78	1049/1276	3.78	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	2	5	3	7	3.33	1201/1273	3.33	4.47	4.38	4.40	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	14	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	880/922	2.88	3.89	4.02	4.02	2.88

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01
Title:	Structure Of English
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	26

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 346 01
Title:	Literary Themes
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1528	4.78	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	368/1527	4.67	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	436/1333	4.63	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	124/1495	4.88	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	239/1439	4.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	681/1508	4.33	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	289/1490	4.57	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1021/1428	4.33	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	580/1436	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	420/1427	4.67	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	475/1425	4.67	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	280/1271	4.71	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1276	4.86	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1273	4.71	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 346 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 12
Title: Literary Themes		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Falco,Raphael		

  

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

### 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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 3 General	1	9 Non-major
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	1	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 351 01
Title:	Studies In Shakespeare
Instructor:	Osherow, Michele

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	700/1528	4.45	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	795/1527	4.35	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	351/1333	4.70	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	576/1495	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	367/1439	4.50	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	826/1425	4.10	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	722/1508	4.30	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	811/1526	4.75	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	663/1490	4.26	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.26
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	686/1428	4.63	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	548/1436	4.89	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	601/1427	4.53	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	448/1425	4.68	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	3	1	12	4.35	464/1291	4.35	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.35
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	487/1271	4.47	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	164/1273	4.93	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	449/922	4.07	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.07

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 351 01
Title:	Studies In Shakespeare
Instructor:	Osherow, Michele

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 364 01
Title:	Persp On Women In Lit
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	5	11	4.15	1025/1528	4.15	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	952/1527	4.20	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	769/1333	4.33	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	12	4.20	903/1495	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	248/1439	4.65	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	0	4	11	4.28	646/1425	4.28	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	11	4.15	908/1508	4.15	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1112/1526	4.45	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	8	6	3.95	992/1490	3.95	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.95
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	1065/1428	4.28	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	886/1436	4.78	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	0	3	11	4.11	1032/1427	4.11	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	4	10	4.17	997/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	3	1	1	3	6	3.57	1035/1291	3.57	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	538/1271	4.42	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	1	8	4.25	828/1273	4.25	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 364 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 26
Title: Persp On Women In Lit		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: McKinley, Kathry		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    0	0.00-0.99    0	A    10	Required for Majors    8	Graduate    1	Major    10
28-55    2	1.00-1.99    0	B    9			
56-83    1	2.00-2.99    1	C    0	General    5	Under-grad    19	Non-major    10
84-150    6	3.00-3.49    7	D    1			
Grad.    1	3.50-4.00    4	F    0	Electives    5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P    0			
		I    0	Other    1		
		?    0			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 371 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	12
Title:	Creative Writing-Fiction		Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Goodman,Ivy H			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	590/1528	4.55	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	882/1527	4.27	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1333	****	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1090/1439	3.73	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	199/1425	4.73	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	972/1508	4.10	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	579/1490	4.33	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	385/1428	4.80	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	1076/1425	4.00	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.12	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	223/1276	4.88	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	268/1273	4.88	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.89	4.02	4.02	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 371 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 12
Title: Creative Writing-Fiction		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Goodman,Ivy H		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01
Title:	Intro To News Writing
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	3	6	3.81	1275/1528	3.81	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	7	4.06	1071/1527	4.06	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1243/1333	3.50	4.29	4.34	4.34	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	1285/1439	3.36	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	852/1425	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	4	1	4	2.93	1439/1508	2.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	2.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	958/1526	4.63	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	7	7	0	3.40	1313/1490	3.40	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1186/1428	4.07	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1019/1436	4.69	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	863/1427	4.31	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	930/1425	4.25	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1183/1291	3.11	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1100/1271	3.44	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1221/1276	3.11	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1180/1273	3.44	4.47	4.38	4.40	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	920/922	1.25	3.89	4.02	4.02	1.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01
Title:	Intro To News Writing
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.33	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01
Title:	Intro To News Writing
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	3									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01
Title:	Feature Writing
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	8	5	3.89	1237/1528	3.89	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	8	6	3.84	1257/1527	3.84	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1333	****	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	8	8	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	9	5	3.83	1002/1439	3.83	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	658/1425	4.26	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	1	5	6	1	2.94	1437/1508	2.94	3.91	4.18	4.17	2.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	839/1526	4.74	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	698/1490	4.23	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1238/1428	3.94	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	996/1436	4.71	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1032/1427	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1060/1425	4.06	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	741/1271	4.12	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	685/1276	4.41	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	804/1273	4.29	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	857/922	3.00	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01
Title:	Feature Writing
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 0	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	6
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	0
			3 ? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 387 01
Title:	Web Design & Authoring
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	183/1528	4.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	13	4.56	501/1527	4.56	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.29	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	369/1495	4.60	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	10	4.13	779/1439	4.13	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	442/1425	4.46	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	626/1508	4.38	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1285/1526	4.25	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	184/1490	4.71	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	806/1428	4.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	964/1436	4.73	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	577/1427	4.55	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	393/1425	4.73	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	253/1291	4.60	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	204/1271	4.80	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1273	4.60	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/922	****	3.89	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 387 01
Title:	Web Design & Authoring
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	4 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0 General	0	Under-grad
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0	16	Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0 Electives	9	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	1	
			? 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1306/1528	3.83	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	0	0	3	5	3.64	1362/1527	3.97	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1183/1333	4.44	4.29	4.34	4.34	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	1	1	6	3.82	1207/1495	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	541/1439	3.89	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	766/1425	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1246/1508	4.00	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	509/1526	4.59	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1180/1490	4.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	6	2	3.50	1364/1428	3.97	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	1290/1436	4.55	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	0	5	3	3.45	1314/1427	3.83	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	1193/1425	3.98	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1194/1291	3.89	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1144/1271	3.92	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1128/1276	4.30	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	909/1273	4.61	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	799/922	3.83	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	12

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

### 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	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	4	1	4	3.07	1480/1528	3.83	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	4	2	4	3.21	1462/1527	3.97	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1333	4.44	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1047/1495	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	2	4	2	3.00	1361/1439	3.89	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	2	5	3.43	1251/1425	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	3	0	6	2	3.42	1353/1508	4.00	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1502/1526	4.59	4.54	4.66	4.68	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1366/1490	4.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	2	3	1	3	2.77	1414/1428	3.97	4.33	4.49	4.48	2.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1394/1436	4.55	4.73	4.74	4.74	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	2	3	1	2.54	1404/1427	3.83	4.23	4.32	4.31	2.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	0	3	4	1	2.69	1395/1425	3.98	4.20	4.34	4.34	2.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1291	3.89	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	1195/1271	3.92	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1003/1276	4.30	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	776/1273	4.61	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	815/922	3.83	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	15

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

### 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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0 General	0	15 Non-major
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Macek, Philip M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1301/1528	3.83	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	979/1527	3.97	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	237/1333	4.44	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	277/1495	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	4	4	5	3.69	1117/1439	3.89	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	215/1425	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	708/1508	4.00	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	4.59	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	675/1490	4.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	637/1428	3.97	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	361/1436	4.55	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	625/1427	3.83	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	556/1425	3.98	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1291	3.89	3.61	4.05	4.09	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	238/1271	3.92	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1276	4.30	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1273	4.61	4.47	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	386/922	3.83	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Macek, Philip M.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Graduate	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	Non-major 11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
			Other 0		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	334/1528	3.83	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1527	3.97	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	228/1333	4.44	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	154/1495	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	13	4.50	367/1439	3.89	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	96/1425	4.30	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	428/1508	4.00	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	853/1526	4.59	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	106/1490	4.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.85
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	133/1428	3.97	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1436	4.55	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	202/1427	3.83	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	320/1425	3.98	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	130/1291	3.89	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	365/1271	3.92	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	234/1276	4.30	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1273	4.61	4.47	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	205/922	3.83	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.53

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Terhorst II, Ray

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1140/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1352/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1333	3.50	4.29	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1047/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1361/1439	3.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	249/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1270/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1203/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1428	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1043/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1259/1427	4.24	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1255/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1291	3.00	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	780/1271	3.73	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1273	4.93	4.47	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	719/922	4.25	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car		

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

### 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 2
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 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0 Electives 0 P 0 I 0 Other 0 ? 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 02
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	835/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	368/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1361/1439	3.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	284/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	579/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.24	4.23	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	3.73	4.12	4.16	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1273	4.93	4.47	4.38	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/922	4.25	3.89	4.02	4.02	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	3	Graduate
				0	Major
					2

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 4
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion															
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2										
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	3	Non-major				1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0										
				I	0	Other		0							
				?	0										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1140/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1113/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1329/1333	3.50	4.29	4.34	4.34	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1481/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1269/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1401/1428	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1080/1427	4.24	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1076/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1195/1271	3.73	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1273	4.93	4.47	4.38	4.40	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	2	Non-major				2
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 responses to be significant						
				P	0										
				I	0	Other		0							
				?	1										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 04
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1521/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1434/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1483/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	891/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1505/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	1.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1406/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1364/1428	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1183/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1379/1427	4.24	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1404/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	2.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1135/1271	3.73	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1273	4.93	4.47	4.38	4.40	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 04	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

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

Discussion														
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	1									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 05
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1521/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1484/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1453/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1345/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1317/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1406/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.00

### 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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 06
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1361/1439	3.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	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	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
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	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1439	3.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	344/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.24	4.23	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 07	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor: Shivnan,Sally A		

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

	I	0	Other		0
	?	1			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 08
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1439	3.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1061/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1406/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.24	4.23	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 08	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor: Shivnan,Sally A		

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

	I	0	Other						0
	?	1							

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 09
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1140/1528	3.93	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1113/1527	4.13	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1047/1495	4.28	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1216/1439	3.67	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	583/1425	4.56	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	681/1508	3.93	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	919/1526	4.91	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	579/1490	3.81	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.40	4.33	4.49	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.88	4.73	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1080/1427	4.24	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1076/1425	4.17	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1135/1271	3.73	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1273	4.93	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.67

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 09
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	3

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	3	Non-major				1
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 responses to be significant						
				P	0										
				I	0	Other		0							
				?	0										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Sly-Thompson,AI

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	3	2	4	1	2.44	1519/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	2.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	4	3	2	2.69	1507/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	2.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1003/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	5	1	3.00	1453/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	6	2	3.00	1361/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	4	4	1	2.80	1384/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	5	0	4	2	3	2.86	1454/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1474/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	2.36
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	0	4	3	3	3.23	1390/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1213/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	1	6	1	1	2.54	1404/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	2.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	0	5	3	1	2.92	1382/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	2.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	2	5	1	0	2.67	1247/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	2.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	3	0	1	2.67	1237/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1026/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1046/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	719/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Sly-Thompson,AI

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.33	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Writing		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Sly-Thompson, AI		

  

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Porter,Jane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	5	4	3.32	1451/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	5	4.00	1113/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	6	8	3.89	1164/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	3	4	4	2.94	1383/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	658/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	4	5	2	5	3.35	1370/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	919/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	734/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	4.20
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	794/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	310/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	792/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	7	6	3.79	1215/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	882/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	900/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	531/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	584/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Porter,Jane

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

### 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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1350/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	932/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1003/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	879/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	6	3.72	1090/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	583/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	7	6	3.83	1185/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	689/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	3	7	0	3.33	1337/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1202/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	1290/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	1207/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	1249/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	895/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.82
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	598/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	272/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12 Required for Majors	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0 General	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives		
			P 0		
			I 0 Other		
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 05
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	1	9	1	3.25	1459/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	3	5	3.63	1366/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1020/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	1353/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	1048/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	2	4	4	3.06	1416/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1285/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1245/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	854/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	1322/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1080/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	5	6	3.75	1226/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	480/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.33

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 05
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives			1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	12	3	3	1	0	1.63	1526/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	1.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	10	4	3	2	0	1.84	1526/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	1.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	6	6	2	3	1	2.28	1490/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	2.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	4	5	0	0	1.74	1437/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	1.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	5	5	2	2	2.53	1398/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	2.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	9	5	2	3	0	1.95	1499/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	1.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	0	8	8	1	3.32	1515/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	3.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	13	2	0	1	1	1.53	1489/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	1.53
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	10	5	2	1	0	1.67	1428/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	1.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1413/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	10	5	0	3	0	1.78	1426/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	1.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	4	1	2	0	1.67	1423/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	1.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	7	1	1	3	0	2.00	1276/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	2.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	2	1	0	2.00	1257/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	1	0	2	2	2.88	1247/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	1248/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	2.88
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	900/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	2.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****

### 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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1472/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	1383/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1198/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1136/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	6	2	3	3.14	1342/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1180/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	1185/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1285/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1110/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	981/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1162/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1052/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	4	3	3.46	1313/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	7	2	3.67	993/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	669/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	696/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	724/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	386/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Technical Writing			Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Walters, April I				

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			0	P	0						
			0	I	0	Other	0				
			2	?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Jamal,Mahbub

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	6	7	3	3.45	1420/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	8	3	3.37	1430/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	1293/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	5	6	3.50	1367/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	5	6	4	3.37	1282/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	8	6	3.85	1016/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	4	4	2	2	2.73	1469/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	2.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	811/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	3	9	1	3.38	1323/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	5	7	3	3.56	1354/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	1244/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	4	4	6	3.56	1290/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	4	7	3.61	1270/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1183/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.11
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1100/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1209/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1233/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	3.11
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Jamal,Mahbub

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.33	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Jamal,Mahbub

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	12	5	2	1	1	1.76	1525/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	1.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	7	1	1	2.29	1519/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	2.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	8	6	3	0	2	2.05	1495/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	2.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	10	6	1	1	1	1.79	1436/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	1.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	11	4	4	0	2	1.95	1421/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	1.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	11	4	2	1	2	1.95	1499/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	1.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	7	5	1	0	1	1.79	1485/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	1.79
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	9	3	3	2	1	2.06	1425/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	2.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	4	3	2	9	3.74	1410/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	3.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	9	4	4	0	1	1.89	1422/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	1.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	9	4	3	0	1	1.82	1422/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	1.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	9	2	2	2	1	2.00	1276/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	2.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	1	0	0	1	1.83	1263/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	1.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	1257/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1267/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	2.33
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	906/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	2.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.33	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	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	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Singh,Yashoda N

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1306/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1071/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	620/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	922/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	657/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	852/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1050/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1185/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	989/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1141/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	916/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	981/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	836/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	3.91
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	1	1	4	3.40	1116/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	994/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	909/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	691/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.60

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Singh,Yashoda N

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****

### 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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 10	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Writing		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Singh, Yashoda N		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0									
				I	0	Other	0							
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Meade,Vicki L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	0	3	10	3.74	1317/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	550/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	447/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	470/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	0	2	3	7	3.41	1264/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	0	4	10	4.06	858/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	428/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	1142/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	1067/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	422/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	548/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	420/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	15	4.42	785/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	3	1	10	4.06	695/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.06
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	0	8	4.09	753/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	376/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	534/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	218/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Meade,Vicki L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	3.50	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/208	****	4.35	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.78	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.60	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/176	****	4.30	4.23	4.33	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.27	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/31	****	5.00	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Meade,Vicki L

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 11	Required for Majors	15 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4 C 1	General	2 Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 12
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	15	0	2	1	1	1.58	1527/1528	2.88	4.02	4.31	4.34	1.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	15	0	1	1	2	1.68	1527/1527	3.26	4.15	4.28	4.27	1.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	5	0	0	0	0	1.00	1332/1333	3.56	4.29	4.34	4.34	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	5	3	0	2	2.12	1494/1495	3.43	4.23	4.25	4.28	2.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	15	1	2	1	0	1.42	1438/1439	2.90	3.99	4.11	4.13	1.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	11	3	1	3	1	1.95	1421/1425	3.38	4.24	4.12	4.17	1.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	12	2	0	2	1	1.71	1505/1508	3.07	3.91	4.18	4.17	1.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	583/1526	4.58	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	9	3	1	1	0	1.57	1488/1490	3.01	4.02	4.11	4.11	1.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	10	3	2	0	2	1.88	1427/1428	3.55	4.33	4.49	4.48	1.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	4	3	3	1	5	3.00	1430/1436	4.26	4.73	4.74	4.74	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	9	2	4	1	0	1.81	1425/1427	3.34	4.23	4.32	4.31	1.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	13	1	1	1	0	1.38	1425/1425	3.15	4.20	4.34	4.34	1.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	1.00	1289/1291	3.13	3.61	4.05	4.09	1.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	2	0	1	0	1.83	1263/1271	3.17	4.12	4.16	4.19	1.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1266/1276	3.72	4.37	4.33	4.37	2.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1260/1273	3.72	4.47	4.38	4.40	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	911/922	3.39	3.89	4.02	4.02	2.20

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 12
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/43	****	4.71	4.43	3.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/36	****	4.33	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01
Title:	Writing Internship
Instructor:	Hickernell, Mary

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	1067/1528	4.12	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	5	3.82	1268/1527	3.82	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1333	****	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1281/1495	3.71	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	7	3	3.65	1135/1439	3.65	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	4	5	3.47	1226/1425	3.47	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	7	4	3	1	2.65	1475/1508	2.65	3.91	4.18	4.17	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.94	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	9	5	1	3.47	1286/1490	3.40	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	1270/1428	3.81	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	1066/1436	4.42	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	1197/1427	3.71	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	6	3	3.56	1285/1425	3.42	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1262/1291	2.38	3.61	4.05	4.09	2.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1037/1271	3.60	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	909/1273	4.10	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	820/922	3.22	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.22

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01
Title:	Writing Internship
Instructor:	Hickernell, Mary

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01
Title:	Writing Internship
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	1067/1528	4.12	4.02	4.31	4.34	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	5	3.82	1268/1527	3.82	4.15	4.28	4.27	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1333	****	4.29	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1281/1495	3.71	4.23	4.25	4.28	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	7	3	3.65	1135/1439	3.65	3.99	4.11	4.13	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	4	5	3.47	1226/1425	3.47	4.24	4.12	4.17	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	7	4	3	1	2.65	1475/1508	2.65	3.91	4.18	4.17	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.94	4.54	4.66	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	7	5	1	3.33	1337/1490	3.40	4.02	4.11	4.11	3.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1319/1428	3.81	4.33	4.49	4.48	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	1340/1436	4.42	4.73	4.74	4.74	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1280/1427	3.71	4.23	4.32	4.31	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	5	2	3.29	1345/1425	3.42	4.20	4.34	4.34	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1269/1291	2.38	3.61	4.05	4.09	2.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1037/1271	3.60	4.12	4.16	4.19	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.37	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	909/1273	4.10	4.47	4.38	4.40	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	820/922	3.22	3.89	4.02	4.02	3.22

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01
Title:	Writing Internship
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	2.88	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	3.13	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.83	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.60	4.34	4.79	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01
Title:	Method Of Interpretation
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	477/1528	4.64	4.02	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	737/1527	4.41	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	468/1333	4.59	4.29	4.34	4.37	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	267/1495	4.71	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	541/1439	4.36	3.99	4.11	4.20	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	553/1425	4.36	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	746/1508	4.29	3.91	4.18	4.24	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1313/1526	4.23	4.54	4.66	4.71	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	479/1490	4.41	4.02	4.11	4.19	4.41
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	553/1428	4.71	4.33	4.49	4.54	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.73	4.74	4.75	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	742/1427	4.43	4.23	4.32	4.37	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	407/1425	4.71	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.71
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	538/1271	4.41	4.12	4.16	4.33	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	622/1276	4.47	4.37	4.33	4.49	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	804/1273	4.29	4.47	4.38	4.55	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/922	****	3.89	4.02	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	24
Title:	Method Of Interpretation		Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean			

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors		20	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	0
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	2							

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01
Title:	Language In Society
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.02	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	259/1527	4.75	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	496/1495	4.50	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	168/1439	4.75	3.99	4.11	4.20	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1508	4.25	3.91	4.18	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1285/1526	4.25	4.54	4.66	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	156/1490	4.75	4.02	4.11	4.19	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.33	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	297/1427	4.75	4.23	4.32	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.20	4.34	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	728/1291	4.00	3.61	4.05	4.10	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.12	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/922	4.75	3.89	4.02	4.23	4.75

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 407 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 7
Title: Language In Society		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Shipka, Jody L.		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	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	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 419 01
Title:	Seminar In Lit & Science
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	795/1528	4.38	4.02	4.31	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	424/1527	4.63	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1003/1333	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1495	4.83	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	108/1439	4.88	3.99	4.11	4.20	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	175/1425	4.75	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	329/1508	4.63	3.91	4.18	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	530/1490	4.38	4.02	4.11	4.19	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	303/1428	4.86	4.33	4.49	4.54	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.73	4.74	4.75	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1427	4.86	4.23	4.32	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	220/1425	4.86	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	3.61	4.05	4.10	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.12	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.37	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	290/1273	4.86	4.47	4.38	4.55	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.89	4.02	4.23	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 419 01
Title:	Seminar In Lit & Science
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/76	5.00	4.75	4.51	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/74	5.00	4.93	4.31	4.42	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/76	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.42	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.42	3.94	4.23	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	2	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 442 01
Title:	Visual Literacy
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	739/1528	4.43	4.02	4.31	4.39	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	1007/1527	4.14	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	237/1333	4.80	4.29	4.34	4.37	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	942/1495	4.17	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	314/1439	4.57	3.99	4.11	4.20	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	563/1425	4.36	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	808/1508	4.23	3.91	4.18	4.24	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.54	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	320/1490	4.54	4.02	4.11	4.19	4.54
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	0	11	4.54	818/1428	4.54	4.33	4.49	4.54	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	709/1436	4.85	4.73	4.74	4.75	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	0	10	4.50	625/1427	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	0	11	4.38	830/1425	4.38	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	102/1291	4.83	3.61	4.05	4.10	4.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	507/1271	4.44	4.12	4.16	4.33	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	223/1276	4.88	4.37	4.33	4.49	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1273	4.78	4.47	4.38	4.55	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/922	5.00	3.89	4.02	4.23	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 442 01
Title:	Visual Literacy
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 451 01
Title:	Seminar In Major Writers
Instructor:	Berman, Jessica

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	214/1528	4.83	4.02	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	438/1527	4.62	4.15	4.28	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	731/1333	4.38	4.29	4.34	4.37	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	227/1495	4.75	4.23	4.25	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	79/1439	4.92	3.99	4.11	4.20	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	292/1425	4.62	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	503/1508	4.46	3.91	4.18	4.24	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.92	4.54	4.66	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	110/1490	4.83	4.02	4.11	4.19	4.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	199/1428	4.92	4.33	4.49	4.54	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.73	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	110/1427	4.92	4.23	4.32	4.37	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	130/1425	4.92	4.20	4.34	4.37	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	849/1291	3.89	3.61	4.05	4.10	3.89
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	289/1271	4.70	4.12	4.16	4.33	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.37	4.33	4.49	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	471/1273	4.70	4.47	4.38	4.55	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/922	4.75	3.89	4.02	4.23	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 451 01
Title:	Seminar In Major Writers
Instructor:	Berman, Jessica

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.75	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.93	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.56	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.69	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	4.42	3.94	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	11 Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 490 01
Title:	Adv Topics In Engl Lang
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	815/1528	4.35	4.02	4.31	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1401/1527	3.53	4.15	4.28	4.30	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	5	3	3.41	1265/1333	3.41	4.29	4.34	4.37	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1311/1495	3.64	4.23	4.25	4.33	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1008/1439	3.82	3.99	4.11	4.20	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	7	3	3.50	1211/1425	3.50	4.24	4.12	4.26	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	1	9	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	3.91	4.18	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1350/1526	4.18	4.54	4.66	4.71	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	5	1	3.31	1348/1490	3.31	4.02	4.11	4.19	3.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1169/1428	4.12	4.33	4.49	4.54	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	1169/1436	4.53	4.73	4.74	4.75	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	6	5	3	3.41	1326/1427	3.41	4.23	4.32	4.37	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	1124/1425	3.94	4.20	4.34	4.37	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	1	4	0	0	2.50	1258/1291	2.50	3.61	4.05	4.10	2.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1077/1271	3.50	4.12	4.16	4.33	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	3	3	1	5	3.67	1102/1276	3.67	4.37	4.33	4.49	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1046/1273	3.83	4.47	4.38	4.55	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	881/922	2.86	3.89	4.02	4.23	2.86

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 490 01
Title:	Adv Topics In Engl Lang
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	2	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						