Baltimore County

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

19

Spring 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101 University of Maryland Page 700 Title COMPOSITION AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA Job IRBR3029

	<u>.</u>													
			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1583/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1398/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1252/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1257/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	2	3.89	1055/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1404/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1216/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1501/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	Λ	2	4	Ο	3 25	1499/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	3	4		1453/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	1	1		1480/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	2		1345/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	2	0		1125/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1191/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	915/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1172/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	865/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	2.50
Frequ	Frequency Distribution													

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201 University of Maryland Page 701 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title COMPOSITION BLOOM, RYAN I. Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Enrollment:

Enrollment:	16				
Questionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	479/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	155/1666		4.21	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406		4.42	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	238/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	643/1566		4.16	4.07	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	300/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	704/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	Λ	0	2	9	4.50	896/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560		4.73	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	181/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	310/1546		4.26	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	0	2	1		1155/1323		3.76	4.00	3.91	3.17
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	2	U	U	5		3.17	1133/1323	3.00	3.70	1.00	3.91	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	384/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	540/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	354/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	443/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.09
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55 56-83	1	1.00-1.99	0 2	В	4	G1	0	TTm days aread	1.0	NT	1.0
84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2	C D	5 0	General	U	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0			are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301 University of Maryland Page 702 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 COMPOSITION Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	19	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

22

0

84-150 Grad.

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

D

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

1

0

Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	518/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.63
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	452/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.63
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.88
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	477/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.58
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	632/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.26
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	152/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.84
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	2	13	4.42	690/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.42
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1498/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.06
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	.ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	263/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.69
	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared																	
1. Were th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	503/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.76
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	647/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was led	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 			explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	658/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.53
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	470/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	3	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	626/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.14
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	579/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.36
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.91
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.91
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	202/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.60
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade:								Do					Tr	~			Majors	
creaits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							ason				Ту	 he			majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Major			s 1	.0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0			
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 6	1													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	0			1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	19

Electives

Other

0

5

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Page 703 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Ouestionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

D 0

F 1

P 0

0

1

I

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401

0

0

84-150 Grad.

3.00-3.49 4

3.50-4.00 4

COMPOSITION

DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Title

Instructor:

	<u> -</u>					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	953/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	516/1666		4.21	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406		4.42	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	592/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	280/1566		4.16	4.07	4.03	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	315/1528		4.35	4.12	4.00	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	757/1650		4.06	4.22	4.28	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	13	2		1524/1667		4.50	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	355/1626		4.14			4.56
	_	_	-		_	_								
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	739/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	366/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	265/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	990/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	221/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	348/1378		4.47	4.10	4.09	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	590/1378		4.54	4.29	4.09	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	629/ 904		4.01		3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	т.	U	U	-1			3.75	029/ 904	3.13	4.01	4.03	3.34	3.73
Freq	ıency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Po:	ason	a			Ty	20			Majors	
creates marined cum. GPA mapercied Grades					a50II	.o 			ту.	 Þe			S	, . – – – –
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 1 A 6	Required for Majors				s 1	.3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0		
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7	1.1													
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 2	General													

Electives

Other

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 704 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General	0	0	1	2	1	_	3	2 46	1540/1670	3.95	1 10	4.31	4 00	3.46
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3 1	1 2	5 2	3 8	4.31	1548/1670 908/1666		4.16 4.21	4.31	4.23	3.46 4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	3	2		1262/1406		4.42	4.27	4.30	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	5		1083/1615		4.42	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	5	2		1341/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.17	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	476/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2			1135/1650		4.06	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92			4.50	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5			1124/1626			4.11	4.07	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	2	5		1391/1559		4.32	4.46	4.47	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82			4.73	4.72	4.68	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	1	5		1237/1549		4.33	4.31	4.32	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2			1305/1546		4.26	4.32	4.32	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	0	2	3	3.25	1200/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	751/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	570/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	698/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.60
Laboratory		_		_	_	_								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	***	***	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,			4.31	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	***	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
=1.11 = 1														
Field Work	10	0	0	^	^	^	1	F 00	 / 11	****	****	4 50	2 01	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12 12	0	0	0	0	0 1	1		****/ 41 ****/ 38	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria					-	_	-		,	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	* * * * *		4.27	4.42	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	***	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County

Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

Frequency Distribution

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

Page 704 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901 University of Maryland Page 705
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 24

	Evaluation	

Questionnaires: 10

			-			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	0 0	om this course	Λ	0	2	1	1	3	3	3 40	1566/1670	3 05	4 16	4 31	4 23	3 40
2. Did the instructo			0	0	1	1	2	2			1435/1666			4.27	4.30	
3. Did the exam ques			0	4	1	0	1	1			1169/1406		4.42	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluat			0	3	1	n	1	3			1349/1615		4.31	4.24	4.17	3.71
5. Did assigned read			0	0	1	2	1	2			1230/1566			4.07	4.03	3.60
6. Did written assign	_	-	0	1	0	1	2	3			1055/1528			4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading s		_	0	3	0	0	3	2			1304/1650				4.28	
8. How many times wa		ainea	0	0	1	4	3	0	_		1665/1667			4.67	4.61	
9. How would you gra		ching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	4			1521/1626				4.07	
J. Hen weard year gra					_	_	_	•	Ū	3.11	1321, 1020	1.07			1.07	3.11
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			0	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1492/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	3.30
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	1	0	1	2			1427/1560				4.68	4.20
3. Was lecture mater		_	0	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1483/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.10
4. Did the lectures	_	-	0	1	2	1	3				1498/1546		4.26	4.32	4.32	2.89
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	vour understanding	1	5	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.00
	1	2														
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1057/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.60
2. Were all students	actively encourag	ed to participate	5	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1334/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	2.80
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	977/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.00
4. Were special tech	nniques successful	_	5	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	779/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.33
_																
	ıency	Dist	crib	atio	n											
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

University of Maryland Page 706
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001

COMPOSITION

23

MABE, MITZI J

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

							Ere	201121	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMDC	Level	Sect
		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	2	1	4	6	3		1557/1670		4.16	4.31	4.23	3.44
		ctor make clear		_	0	0	3	4	7	2	0		1645/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	2.50
	_	uestions reflec			0	14	0	0	1	1	0		****/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	****
		uations reflect		1 3	0	0	2	3	4	7	0		1565/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	2	1	4	5	2	2		1478/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.00
		_		to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	7		1113/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	3.81
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	8	3	3	2	0		1639/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	1.94
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	15		472/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	
9. How v	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective						1	2	7	5	1	3.19	1513/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	3.19
1. Were	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	4	4	6	1	1	2.44	1544/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	2.44
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	948/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.75
				explained clearly	1	0	0	3	7	5	0	3.13	1478/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	3.13
		es contribute t			0	0	3	3	4	4	2	2.94	1489/1546		4.26	4.32	4.32	2.94
				your understanding	0	7	1	1	3	4	0		1170/1323		3.76	4.00	3.91	3.11
		Discus	gion															
1 Did (clace diec			what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	932/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.90
				ed to participate	6	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	894/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.20
		_	_	nd open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	977/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.00
		echniques succe		ia open arbeassion	6	1	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	619/ 904		4.01	4.03	3.94	3.78
				_			,											
		Frequ	ıency	, Dis.	trib	utioi	1											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	i
00-27 6 0.00-0.99 1 A 2						Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	 s 1	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 11	•						_	-	- 21010101	-	-	5		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	1	А	2	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201 University of Maryland Page 707 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 PUTZEL, DIANE M Spring 2008 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15				
Questionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	1		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	1116/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.14
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	1154/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.07
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	922/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.21
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	te to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	610/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.29
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contri	bute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	338/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.62
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1032/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.14
8. How man	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wo). How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened						1	0	1	4	5	4.09	905/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.09
1. Were t	Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	5	8	4.50	896/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.50
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1023/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.71
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	736/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.46
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	715/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance y	your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	364/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.46
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	te to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	324/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.67
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	481/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.67
		_	_	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	439/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sful	-	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	445/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.08
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Expected Grades				D.O.	asons	,			Ty	no.			Majors	1		
credits E		Cum. GPA		Expedied Grades					ason:	> 				 ħe				,
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majo						s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В 4	a							_	_	_	_			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								•						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives							0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh

Other

1

responses to be significant

0

0

0

Ρ

I

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401 University of Maryland Page 708
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

? 0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

		Ouestion	~		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4					_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect	
		Question	5 		NK.	NA				- 4 		Mean	Rank	mean 	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	902/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	622/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	813/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.30
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ate to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	317/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.64
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	323/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.64
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	903/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	324/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.60
	Lecture																	
	Lecture																	
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	3	8	4.73		4.17		4.46	4.47	4.73
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	0	10	4.82	,	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.82
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	1	3	7	4.55	,	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.55
		s contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	,	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	7	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.00
		Discus			_			_			_		005/4004					
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2		4.71	,	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.71
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2		4.71	,	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.71
		_		d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		6	1	0	0	Τ	3	Τ	4.00	461/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	.
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Required for Major						5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			nera:											
56-83	0	2.00-2.99										1	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	rh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0	Other							3						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501 University of Maryland Page 709
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 14

Questions

C+udon+	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

	2 400 010110						_	_		-		110011	1101111	110011	110011	ricari	110011	110011
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1216/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1015/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.21
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	712/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.38
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1263/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.55
6. Did wri	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	368/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.57
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	1	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	844/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.31
8. How mar	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1072/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.62
9. How wou	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	953/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.00
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	946/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.46	
2. Did the	e instru	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	929/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.77		
		explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	,	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.38		
		es contribute t		-	1	0	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	1139/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	912/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.77
		Discus																
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	2				4.28	4.10	3.92	
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1			860/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.25
		_		nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3		439/1378		4.54	4.31	4.08	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	***
				Frequ	ıency	r Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr							Rea	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	\$
	00-27 6 0.00-0.99 0 A 10						quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	. 0	Graduate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 2													_					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-gr	ad 1	.4	Non-	-major	14
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0						_												
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - M				_	ſh
Р 0												response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		

Other

1

I

?

0

Course-Section:ENGL 100 1601University of MarylandPage 710TitleCOMPOSITIONBaltimore CountyAUG 6, 2008Instructor:PUTZEL, DIANE MSpring 2008Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	15	Student	Cource	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnaires.	13	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

				- <u>-</u>				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	w insights,skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	722/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.47
2. Did the instruct	tor make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	490/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the	expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	308/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.73
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	491/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.40
6. Did written ass	ignments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	398/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.53
7. Was the grading	system clearly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	527/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.53
8. How many times w	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.93
9. How would you gr	. How would you grade the overall teaching effective						0	6	8	4.57	347/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.57
	Lecture															
1. Were the instru	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	3	11	4.67	673/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.67
	tor seem interested		0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	855/1560		4.73	4.72	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	395/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.73
	s contribute to what		0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	345/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	423/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.40
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	249/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.77
	ts actively encourage	_	2	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	649/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.46
	tor encourage fair a		2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	225/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.92
4. Were special ted	. Were special techniques successful						1	4	5	4.40	289/ 904	3.73	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.40
		ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	ре			Majors	
00-27 5	0 00-0 99 0	 Δ 7		Required for Majors 15						 5	Graduat		0	Maio		0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	Λ						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701

21

COMPOSITION

WALTERS, APRIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 711

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	auer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	2	2 67	1486/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	4		1148/1666			4.31	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	799/1406		4.42	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	737/1615		4.31	4.24	4.17	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	7	0		1406/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	546/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	806/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1368/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	953/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5			1036/1549		4.33	4.31	4.32	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5			1139/1546		4.26	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	5	0		1099/1323			4.00	3.91	
Discussion	E	0	1	0	2	1	0	2 20	1101/1204	1 12	4 20	1 10	2 02	2 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5 5	0	0	0	2	4 2	0	4.14	1191/1384 915/1378	4.13 4.41	4.28 4.47	4.10 4.29	3.92 4.09	3.29 4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	915/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5 5	2	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	802/ 904		4.01	4.03		3.20
1. Were special techniques successful	J	2	U	2	U	J	U	3.20	002/ 304	3.73	1.01	1.05	3.94	3.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	***	****	4.31	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	***	4.47	4.28	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	***	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701 Title COMPOSITION

Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 711 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901 University of Maryland Page 712 AUG 6, 2008 COMPOSITION Baltimore County Spring 2008 MACEK, PHILIP Job IRBR3029 21

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

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

						Fre	eque	ncie	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	2	3	2	3	1	2.82	1639/1670	3.95	4.16	4.31	4.23	2.82
_	_	ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	3	3	5		1048/1666		4.21	4.27	4.30	4.18
		uestions reflect the	_	0	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	423/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1234/1615	4.21	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.91
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	1	0	2.89	1515/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	2.89
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	899/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly expl	ained	2	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1288/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.89
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	4.55	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1124/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	3.90
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	996/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.43
		ctor seem interested		4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1188/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.57
		terial presented and	3	4	0	0	0	1	2	4		789/1549		4.33	4.31	4.32	4.43
		es contribute to what		4	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1404/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	3.43
		l techniques enhance	-	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	3.60	3.76	4.00	3.91	***
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1033/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.67
		nts actively encourage		5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83			4.47	4.29	4.09	4.83
		ctor encourage fair a		5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378		4.54	4.31	4.08	5.00
		echniques successful		5	3	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	860/ 904		4.01	4.03	3.94	
			Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	9	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 6														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Page 713
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001

COMPOSITION

WILKINSON, RACH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 17

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_	_	_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	505/1670		4.16	4.31	4.23	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.49	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	446/1615		4.31	4.24	4.17	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	226/1566	3.89	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	221/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	570/1650	4.08	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5 2	11		1002/1667		4.50	4.67	4.61	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	2	12	4.86	141/1626	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	339/1559	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	294/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	692/1323		3.76	4.00	3.91	4.00
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	_	U	J	J	U	1.00	092/1323	3.00	3.70	1.00	3.91	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	364/1384	4.13	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	306/1378	4.41	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	226/ 904		4.01	4.03		4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	^	0	1	F 00	****		4 02	4 65	4 60	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.02	4.42	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.42	***
5. Did conferences neip you carry out freid activities	тο	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	31			4.4/	4.28	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	-	-	-	-	-								

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH Spring 2008

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 17

Page 713 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101 University of Maryland Page 714 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 COMPOSITION DUNNIGAN, BRIAN Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	20	_	
Questionnaires:	15	Student Course Eval	uation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

					1				Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	479/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	490/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.60
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	318/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did otl	her evalı	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	434/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.62
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	242/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.73
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	173/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.80
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	429/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1409/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.20
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	293/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.64
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.79
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.93
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	646/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.54
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	582/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	3	5	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	626/1323	4.03	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.14
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	324/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.67
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	l to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	564/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.56
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	l open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	417/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.78
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	6	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	146/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.75
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	rease understa	nding of	the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	***
2. Were ye	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backg	round information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	***
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	***
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27		0 00 0 00		 А 7		Reasons Required for Majors						0			0	Mo de		 0
28-55	4 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4					кес	quir	eu I	OT IM	ajor	D	9	Graduat	E	0	Majo)T	U
28-55 56-83						00-	nera	1				0	IIndon	rad 1	.5	N™o∽	mo dos	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		Gei	nera.	_				U	Under-g	ıau I	. 5	NOI1-	-major	13
Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	Б 0 F 0		רם.	2a+ ÷ •	7700				0	#### -	Means +	here -	ro not	enous	rh	
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	1	P 0		Electives						U	#### - respons				_	111
				I 0		Other						3	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı.	16	
				5 O		OEI	ner					3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 University of Maryland Page 715
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

0

1

Queberonni	all co	13		Beadene eou	LIBC		uucı	011 Q	2001	. 01111	.all c							
							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L														4.27 4.30 4.32 4.31 4.24 4.17 4.07 4.03 4.12 4.00 4.22 4.28 4.67 4.61 4.11 4.07 4.46 4.47 4.72 4.68 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.32 4.30 3.91 4.10 3.92 4.29 4.09 4.31 4.08	
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	4.00	1216/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1103/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.13
3. Did th	ie exam g	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	1186/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	3.80
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	861/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.27
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1210/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.64
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	631/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.33
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	/ expla	ained	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1235/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.93
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	861/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	808/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.18
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1237/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.19
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	985/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.73
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1120/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.07	
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1139/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	1	6	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1179/1323	4.03	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	712/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	603/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	air ar	nd open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	948/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.10
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	ssful		5	5	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	605/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.80
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00 27		0.00-0.99									1	Cradust		0				
00-27 28-55	6 1	A 4		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	s I	Τ.	Graduat	е	0	мајо)r	0		
	1	B 10 C 0		a		1				^	TT1		_	Man		1 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99			Gei	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rau I	.5	non-	-major	15	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 2	D 0 F 0		TO 7	ecti [.]					1		Moona +	homo -			-h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	۷	F 0		E.T.	ect1	ves				1)TT
				P U								_	respons	es to D	e sign	ıııcar	IL	

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 University of Maryland Page 716
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

					Frequencies				3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	4.00	1216/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1103/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.13
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	1186/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	3.80
4. Did otl	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	861/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.27
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1210/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.64
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	631/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1235/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.93
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	861/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.80
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.18
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1157/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.19
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.73
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.07
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	12	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	4.03	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	712/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.20
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	603/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	948/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.10
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		5	5	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	605/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.80
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Tν	ре			Majors	
00-27 28-55	6	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 10		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	1 0	2.00-1.99	2			a	nerai	1				0	IIndor -	20 d 1	.5	Moss	mo i o	15
56-83 84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera.	T				U	Under-g	rau l	.5	NON-	-major	12
Grad.	200 0 0.00 0.19 0 2 0					. וים	ecti	700				1	#### -	Moana +	horo	ro not	onom	h
Grad.	ad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F C					БТ	ect1,	ves				т	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					3	respons	CD LU L	e sign	ııı ıcal	10	
				1 0		UL.	ner					3						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.

Spring 2008

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 717 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	1358/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1059/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	924/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1173/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1274/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	832/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	8	6	4.06	1107/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1142/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	1	9	3	3.87	1162/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0		10	7		1009/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	358/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6		4.29	944/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8			835/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	6	1	1	3.00	1179/1323	4.03	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	820/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	603/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3		4.69	511/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	2	10	3	3.94	537/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	***	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	***	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301 Title COMPOSITION Instructor:

BLOOM, RYAN I.

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 717 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401 University of Maryland Page 718
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	7	7	4.13	1139/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	895/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	799/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	898/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	643/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	398/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.53
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	1	1	0	5	7	2		1430/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	2	12	1		1623/1667		4.50	4.67	4.61	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	141/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	821/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	673/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	537/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	939/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	507/1323	4.03	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	560/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	517/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	225/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	443/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.09
- -														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401 University of Maryland Page 719
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	7	7	4.13	1139/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	895/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	799/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	898/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	643/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	398/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	5	7	2	3.60	1430/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	2	12	1	3.81	1623/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67	4.61	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	673/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	366/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	520/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1323		3.76	4.00	3.91	4.40
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	560/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	517/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	225/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	443/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.09

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION

Baltimore County Spring 2008 HAZELL, ERIC Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 18

Page 720 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	271/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	104/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	79/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	255/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1142/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67	4.61	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	183/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	166/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	-	17	5.00	1/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	139/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	156/1323		3.76	4.00	3.91	
J. Did dddiovibadi ecciniiqueb ciniance your anderbeanding	O	5	O	O	_	_	13	1.00	130/1323	1.05	3.70	1.00	3.71	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	118/1384		4.28	4.10	3.92	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 218	****	***	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
3. Were effected for grading made effect	10	O	O	O	O	Ü	2	3.00	, 00		1.55	3.71	3.77	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	-	-	-	-	_	- ,	, ,					

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: HAZELL, ERIC

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 720 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL Spring 2008

Title

Page 721 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Conoval														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	6	5	3 94	1292/1670	4 24	4.16	4 31	4.23	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	5		1370/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	2	2	4		1057/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	962/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	7	3	3	3.24	1415/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	778/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4			997/1650	4.24		4.22	4.28	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11			1326/1667			4.67	4.61	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	5	1	3.58	1354/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	6		1150/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	11		1090/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	900/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0 1	0	0	6 4	3 6			1139/1546 794/1323	4.48 4.03	4.26	4.32	4.32 3.91	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	U	U	4	0	3	3.94	194/1323	4.03	3.70	4.00	3.91	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	987/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	2	3		1174/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8 8	0 1	0	0 2	3 2	2		4.11	942/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	U	2	2	1	3	3.63	689/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	***	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 87	***	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
 Did research projects contribute to what you learned Did presentations contribute to what you learned 	15 15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 75 ****/ 79	****	4.50	4.57 4.45	4.46 4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	***
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U	U	U	U	2	U	1.00	/ 00		1.33	3.91	3.99	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	***	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL

COMPOSITION
WALTERS, APRIL

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 721 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION

Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 722

AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: HAZELL, ERIC (Instr. A) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 25

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	544/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	233/1666	4.40	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	240/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3		4.83	224/1615	4.44	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	480/1566	4.11	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2		4.76	211/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2			173/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0		12			1388/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67		4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	239/1626	4.42	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	834/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	985/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3		4.68	463/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4		4.63	557/1546	4.48	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	172/1323	4.03	3.76	4.00	3.91	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3		4.59	384/1384		4.28	4.10	3.92	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	146/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	0		4.47	682/1378	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	128/ 904	4.17	4.01	4.03	3.94	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	***	4.18	4.47	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801

25

Enrollment:

COMPOSITION

Title HAZELL, ERIC Instructor:

(Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 722 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801 Uni

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: HAZELL, ERIC (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 723

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions Rank General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 1 2 14 4.61 544/1670 4.24 4.16 4.31 4.23 4.61 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 1 16 4.83 233/1666 4.40 4.21 4.27 4.30 4.83 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 11 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 240/1406 4.41 4.42 4.32 4.31 4.83 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 224/1615 4.44 4.31 4.24 4.17 4.83 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 1 0 2 2 12 4.41 480/1566 4.11 4.16 4.07 4.03 4.41 0 1 2 14 4.76 211/1528 4.53 4.35 4.12 4.00 4.76 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 173/1650 4.24 4.06 4.22 4.28 4.89 1 0 0 0 1 12 5 4.22 1388/1667 4.36 4.50 4.67 4.61 4.22 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 126/1626 4.42 4.14 4.11 4.07 4.80 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 772/1559 4.49 4.32 4.46 4.47 4.58 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 1 0 10 4.82 829/1560 4.83 4.73 4.72 4.68 4.78 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 294/1549 4.59 4.33 4.31 4.32 4.74 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 231/1546 4.48 4.26 4.32 4.32 4.77 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 2 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 260/1323 4.03 3.76 4.00 3.91 4.70 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 3 12 4.59 384/1384 4.33 4.28 4.10 3.92 4.59 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 16 4.94 146/1378 4.54 4.47 4.29 4.09 4.94 0 14 4.47 682/1378 4.52 4.54 4.31 4.08 4.47 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 9 4.80 128/ 904 4.17 4.01 4.03 3.94 4.80 Laboratory 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 232 **** *** 4.19 4.25 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 239 **** **** 4.21 4.35 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 230 **** *** 4.44 4.58 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 2 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 231 **** **** 4.31 4.45 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 218 **** **** 4.18 4.47 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 3 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 4.83 4.65 4.67 **** 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.38 4.64 4.72 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 3 5.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.50 4.57 4.46 **** Ω 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 16 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.00 4.45 4.59 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 3.97 3.99 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.50 3.91 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** *** 4.19 4.07 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.62 4.63 **** 18 0 0 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 18 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.27 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.47 4.28 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned $18 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.64 4.59 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 16 *** *** 4.67 4.83 ****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 27 *** *** 4.54 4.46 ***

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 10 *** *** 4.84 4.75 ***

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 6 *** *** 4.92 4.83 ****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801

COMPOSITION

Title Instructor:

HAZELL, ERIC (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25 Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 723 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	F 0 Electives		0	#### - Means	#### - Means there are not			
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	4					
				?	0							

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901

21

COMPOSITION

KIDD, KATHLEEN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Page 724 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencie		ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	4	3 22	1358/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.23	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	846/1666		4.21	4.27	4.30	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	515/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3		4.47	592/1615		4.31	4.24	4.17	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	9	5	4.20	706/1566		4.16	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	421/1528	4.53	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	985/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12		922/1667		4.50	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	1	5	2		1143/1626		4.14	4.11	4.07	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1185/1559	4.49	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	9		1054/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	352/1549	4.59	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	949/1546		4.26	4.32	4.32	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	0	7	1	3	3.23	1132/1323	4.03	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	8	3	3.86	953/1384	4.33	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	884/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	926/1378		4.54	4.31	4.08	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	1	1	2	2	1		812/ 904			4.03	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50		****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901 Title COMPOSITION Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN

21

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 724 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101

Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

COLLINS, ELSA T Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 725 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies			Tnet	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	567/1670	4.59	4.16	4.31	4.23	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	452/1666	4.64	4.21	4.27	4.30	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	483/1406	4.61	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	12	4.14	1000/1615	4.14	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	491/1566	4.41	4.16	4.07	4.03	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	406/1528	4.52	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	926/1650	4.24	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	387/1626	4.53	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.53
Lecture	-	0	•	0	-	0	1.0	4 00	410 /1550	4 00	4 20	1 10	4 45	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	419/1559	4.82	4.32	4.46	4.47	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	699/1560	4.86	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	463/1549	4.68	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	445/1546	4.73	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	3	5	8	3.94	768/1323	3.94	3.76	4.00	3.91	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	364/1384	4.62	4.28	4.10	3.92	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	579/1378	4.54	4.47	4.29	4.09	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	602/1378	4.58	4.54	4.31	4.08	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	2	3	7		421/ 904		4.01		3.94	4.15
4. Were special techniques successivi	10	U	_	U	2	J	,	4.13	421/ 904	1.13	4.01	1.05	3.74	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	***	4.33	3.97	3.99	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.63	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.02	4.63	****
	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	^^^/ 31			4.4/	4.28	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101

Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 725 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
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	ı
				P	0		responses to		be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0101 INTRODUCTION TO LIT

Questionnaires: 24

Page 726 Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 51

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	5	9	3	3.17	1607/1670	3.49	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	10	1	7	3.29	1573/1666	3.46	4.21	4.27	4.27	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1175/1406	3.83	4.42	4.32	4.39	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	3	6	5	4	3.30	1519/1615	3.50	4.31	4.24	4.29	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	7	9	3.83	1078/1566	4.05	4.16	4.07	4.00	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	9	6	3.67	1202/1528	3.50	4.35	4.12	4.11	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	6	5	5	4	3.04	1575/1650	3.28	4.06	4.22	4.20	3.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	6	11	7	0	3.04	1661/1667	3.51	4.50	4.67	4.64	3.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	4	9	4	2	3.10	1529/1626	3.43	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	4	8	6	4	3.25	1499/1559	3.63	4.32	4.46	4.40	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	2	6	13	4.21	1424/1560	4.46	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	7	6	5	3.48	1401/1549	3.74	4.33	4.31	4.25	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	3	6	2	7	3.13	1463/1546	3.61	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1323	2.70	3.76	4.00	4.08	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	3	1	3	1	3.25	1200/1384	3.92	4.28	4.10	4.07	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	1193/1378	4.01	4.47	4.29	4.25	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	777/1378	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.26	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 904	4.32	4.01	4.03	4.01	***

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0		9	Required for Majors	5	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	=			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0201 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT

University of Maryland Page 727 AUG 6, 2008 Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

FINDLAY, JOANNA Instructor: Enrollment:

1	Furoriment.	54
(Ouestionnaires:	38

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

4

2

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.50-4.00

3.00-3.49 10

1

3

в 14

C 9

D 0

F 0

Ctudont	Comman	Errolinotion	Ougstionnoins
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	
General	0	^	1	4	1.0	0	1 1	2 02	1407/1670	2 40	1 10	4 21	4 20	2
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	10	9	14		1407/1670		4.16	4.31	4.32	
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17 5	12 15	7 12		1465/1666 1164/1406	3.46 3.83	$4.21 \\ 4.42$	4.27	4.27 4.39	
-		1	2		12		11							
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	10 14	19		1356/1615 632/1566		4.31 4.16	4.24	4.29	
	0	0	5	5	7	14	19 7		1362/1500		4.16	4.07		
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	8	9	10	10		1454/1650		4.35	4.12	4.11	
How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	30			1549/1667			4.67	4.64	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	10	12	_		1247/1626			4.11	4.06	
now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	U	U	U	10	12	4	3.77	124//1020	3.43	4.14	4.11	4.06	
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	5	17	10		1280/1559		4.32	4.46	4.40	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	6	26		1042/1560		4.73	4.72	4.73	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	7	13			1146/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	6	9			1110/1546			4.32	4.30	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	9	3	7	3	5	2.70	1256/1323	2.70	3.76	4.00	4.08	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	5	20	4.59	378/1384	3.92	4.28	4.10	4.07	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	595/1378	4.01	4.47	4.29	4.25	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	570/1378	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.26	
Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	339/ 904	4.32	4.01	4.03	4.01	4
Laboratory														
Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	***	4.21	4.33	
Seminar														
Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.95	
Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	
Field Work														
Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	
Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	
To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	
Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	***	4.47	4.00	
Self Paced														
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	
Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	
Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	
Freque	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
	- 1					_			_				Ma di -	_
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	S

General

Electives

3

1

Under-grad 38

- Means there are not enough

Non-major 38

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101

Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE

Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 728 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
x														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	6	1	9	8	3.39	1568/1670	3.39	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	6	16	4.21	1015/1666	4.21	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	4	18	4.38	739/1406	4.38	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	9	4	10	3.70	1356/1615	3.70	4.31	4.24	4.29	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	3	4	2	11	3.18	1437/1566	3.18	4.16	4.07	4.00	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	6	2	4	11	3.44	1306/1528	3.44	4.35	4.12	4.11	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	4	4	15	4.15	1020/1650	4.15	4.06	4.22	4.20	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	2	1	8	13	1	3.40	1656/1667	3.40	4.50	4.67	4.64	3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	3	9	5	6	3.50	1384/1626	3.50	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	6	7	7	3 56	1453/1559	3.56	4.32	4.46	4.40	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	5	5	13		1438/1560		4.73	4.72	4.73	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	5	4			1351/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	6	1	6			1222/1546		4.26	4.32	4.30	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	17	1	0	1	0			****/1323		3.76	4.00	4.08	****
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	Ι,	1	U	1	U	J	3.00	/1323		3.70	4.00	1.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	4	2	2	6		1154/1384		4.28	4.10	4.07	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	3	2	0	9		1185/1378		4.47	4.29	4.25	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	2	3	2	7		1159/1378	3.63	4.54	4.31	4.26	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	4.01	4.03	4.01	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	***	****	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	۷ /	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 60		4.33	3.91	4.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 6		****	4.92	****	****
5. Here shere chaugh proceeds for all the stadenes	20	_	J	J	0	•	_	3.00	, 0			1.72		

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101 Title

ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE

Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 728 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241A 0101 University of Maryland Title KING ARTHUR OF BRITAIN

Baltimore County ORGELFINGER, GA Spring 2008

Page 729

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 36 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque:	ncie 3	es 4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	15	16	4 22	1027/1670	4.22	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	17	11		1234/1666		4.10	4.31	4.32	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	14	17	4.33			4.42	4.32	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	6	17	10		1072/1615		4.31	4.24	4.29	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	29	4.74	234/1566	4.74	4.16	4.07	4.00	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		1	2	3	9	13	7		1241/1528		4.35	4.12	4.11	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	9	13	8		1445/1650		4.06	4.22	4.20	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	30	4.83	,		4.50	4.67	4.64	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	17	10	4.16	831/1626	4.16	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	403/1559	4.82	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	11	18	4.42	,		4.33	4.31	4.25	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	9	22	4.50	-,		4.26	4.32	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	7	13	12	4.09	659/1323	4.09	3.76	4.00	4.08	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	7	9	8	3.85	957/1384	3.85	4.28	4.10	4.07	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	5	8	11	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.47	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	9	15	4.42	731/1378	4.42	4.54	4.31	4.26	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	7	10	7	3.92	548/ 904	3.92	4.01	4.03	4.01	3.92
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****
Fred	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	:			Re	ason	ıs			Ty	ne			Majors	
Barred Cum. GrA Bapeceed Grades	, 													
00-27 5 0.00-0.99 0 A 12		Re	quir	ed f	or M	Iajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	10
28-55 8 1.00-1.99 0 B 17 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 5		Co	nera	1			1	.2	Under-g	rad 3	6	Non-	major	26
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 5 D 0		Ge	nera.	1			1	. 4	onder -g	rau 3	O	NOII-	ilia JOI	20
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 13 F 0		El	ecti	ves				4	#### -					h
P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0		Ot.	her					9						
? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101

CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 39

Baltimore County Spring 2008 BENSON, LINDA K

Page 730 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	24	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire
-----------------	----	----------------	--------------------------

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	943/1670	4.30	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	3	13	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	715/1406	4.41	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	962/1615	4.17	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	17	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.16	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	570/1528	4.39	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.06	4.22	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	1032/1667	4.65	4.50	4.67	4.64	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.20
Lecture	_			_		_		4 0-						
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	0	5	13		1092/1559	4.33	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	17		1054/1560	4.70	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	1	5	11		1010/1549	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	2	0	2	13		919/1546		4.26	4.32	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	4	0	6	3	5	3.28	1117/1323	3.28	3.76	4.00	4.08	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	730/1384	4.18	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	740/1378	4.39	4.47	4.29	4.25	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	602/1378	4.59	4.54	4.31		4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	234/ 904				4.01	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
Quantum and														
Seminar	0.1	0	^	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ O7		4 02	4 65	F 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	2	0	0	0	0		5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79		4.38	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21 21	0	0	0 1	0	2	1 2	4.33	****/ 79 ****/ 80	****	4.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	U	U	Т	U	U	2	4.00	****/ 80		4.33	3.97	4.30	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced	0.1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4 22	****/ 28	****	****	1 61	++++	++++
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	, 20	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	/ 10	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	^^^*	^^^	4.54	^^^	* * * * *

University of Maryland

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101

Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 730 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 731

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	350/1670	4.76	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	846/1666	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	892/1406	4.24	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	898/1615	4.24	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	218/1566	4.76	4.16	4.07	4.00	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	462/1528	4.47	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	782/1650	4.35	4.06	4.22	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1097/1667	4.59	4.50	4.67	4.64	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.38
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	265/1546	4.88	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance y	-	3	1	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	266/1323	4.62	3.76	4.00	4.08	4.62
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to	what vou learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	340/1384	4.64	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.64
2. Were all students actively encourage	-	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1378	4.93	4.47	4.29	4.25	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair an		3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	550/1378	4.64	4.54	4.31	4.26	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful		3	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	417/ 904		4.01	4.03	4.01	4.17
	Frequ	iency	Dis	ribu	ıtior	ı									
	-														
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: ENGL 250H 0101 University of Maryland INTO TO SHAKESPEARE-HO Title Baltimore County

Page 732 AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 5

Questionnaires:	5		Student	Course	Evalı	uatio	n Qı	uesti	onna	ire	
						Fre	que	ncies			Instru
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	_	•	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.16	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0		-	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	_	•	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	-	-	0	2	3	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	C	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.16	4.07	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ned 0	0	C	•	0	2	3	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	C	0	1	0	4	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.06	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	C	0	0	2	3	4.60	1082/1667	4.60	4.50	4.67	4.64	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened	ess 0	0	C	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.32	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	y 1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ng 1	1	C	0	0	2	1	4.33	481/1323	4.33	3.76	4.00	4.08	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	d 3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	e 3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	on 3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	C	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.01	4.03	4.01	****
Fi	requency	y Di	stri	butio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	des			Re	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		 R		red :	or M	aior		0	 Graduate		0	 Majo		 1

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Instructor

Rank

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

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 733

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.71	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.71
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	355/1666		4.21	4.27	4.27	4.71
		uestions reflec			0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406		4.42	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	176/1615	4.91	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.91
5. Did ass	igned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	510/1566	4.38	4.16	4.07	4.00	4.38
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	147/1528	4.86	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.86
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	4	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1079/1650	4.10	4.06	4.22	4.20	4.10
	_	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667		4.50	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	605/1626	4.36	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.36
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	572/1559	4.73	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.73
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lec	ture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	284/1549	4.82	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.82
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	667/1546	4.55	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.55
5. Did aud	liovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.76	4.00	4.08	****
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ss discu		what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.80	
			d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378		4.47	4.29	4.25	5.00	
		_	_	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	4	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/ 904	4.88	4.01	4.03	4.01	4.88
		Q a mail and a second																
1 Woro 20	uaiamod t	Semina:		announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	5.00	****
	_	-		ividual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.75	****
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75		4.50	4.57	4.25	****
	_	ons contribute		-	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.95	****
_		for grading mad		-	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	***
1 Did fie	ld exner	Field Field		hat you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
				uation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
_	_	ctor available			13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
		could you disc			13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
	_	-	_		13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities						⊦ n i bı	.+	•									
								utio	.1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	 Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			\			J					•) -		-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0		Ger	nera	1				7	Under-g	rad 1	L4	Non-	-major	6	
84-150 Grad.	3 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	2 4	D 0 F 0		רק.	ectiv	700				2	#### -	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	7	P 0		r.T.	ECLIV	ves				4	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					5	respons	- LO 1	oc bigi	cai		
				± 0		001						_						

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101 University of Maryland Page 734 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

MCGURRIN JR, AN

Instructor: Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2008

Ouestions	NR	NT 7	Fre	equer	ncies	; 1	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions		NA				- 1		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1566/1670	3.40	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1597/1666	3.10	4.21	4.27	4.27	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.42	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	3	1		1448/1615		4.31	4.24	4.29	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	2		1385/1566		4.16	4.07	4.00	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	1	4		1140/1528		4.35	4.12	4.11	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	2	2	1	0		1624/1650		4.06	4.22	4.20	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	5	3	0		1663/1667	3.00	4.50	4.67	4.64	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1534/1626	3.00	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.00
T a selection														
Lecture	1	0	2	0	2	_	0	2 11	1514/1559	2 11	4.32	1 10	4 40	2 11
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0		2	0		1457/1560		4.32	4.46 4.72	4.40 4.73	3.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1 1	1	3	4	5		1457/1560		4.73	4.72	4.73	4.11 3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	3	1		1498/1549		4.33	4.31	4.30	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	0	0	0		****/1323			4.00	4.08	****
5. Did additivisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0		U	U	U	U	1.00	/1323		3.70	4.00	4.00	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	_	4.00	,		4.47	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	1		,		4.54	4.31	4.26	4.00
									,					
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0		Ger	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	7
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

0

responses to be significant

P

I

0

0 2 Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101

INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Title

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 735 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	479/1670	4.14	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	452/1666	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/1406	4.31	4.42	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	412/1615	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	851/1566	3.76	4.16	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	600/1528		4.35	4.12	4.11	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	6		1008/1650	3.60	4.06	4.22	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 2	0	0	0	0 2	5 2	7 6	4.58	1097/1667	4.59	4.50	4.67	4.64	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	2	2	ь	4.40	563/1626	4.13	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	673/1559	4.20	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	4.79	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	220/1549	4.42	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	655/1546	4.06	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	0	0	1		****/1323			4.00	4.08	****
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	570/1384	4.45	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	4.76	4.47	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	777/1378	4.61	4.54	4.31	4.26	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.03	4.01	4.03	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
Garden en														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	г оо	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1 0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.83	4.65	5.00 4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.30	4.45	3.95	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	***
J. Were Criteria for grading made crear	11	O	U	U	U		U	1.00	/ 00		1.33	3.91	1.50	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101 Title

INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 735 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201 University of Maryland Page 736 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	1094/1670	4.14	4.16	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	1070/1666	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.17
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	852/1406	4.31	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.29
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	552/1615	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	13	4.39	510/1566	3.76	4.16	4.07	4.00	4.39
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	383/1528	4.34	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.56
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	744/1650	3.60	4.06	4.22	4.20	4.39
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1216/1667	4.59	4.50	4.67	4.64	4.44
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	797/1626	4.13	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.20
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc			2	0	0	0	2	6	8		1052/1559		4.32	4.46	4.40	4.38
Did the instruct		-	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	,		4.73	4.72	4.73	4.81
Was lecture mate	_		2	0	0	0	3	2	11		683/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	1040/1546	4.06	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.19
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		what you learned	3	0	Ο	0	2	2	11	4.60	372/1384	4.45	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.60
2. Were all student		-	3	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	718/1378	4.76	4.47	4.29	4.25	4.40
			3	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	692/1378		4.54	4.31	4.26	4.47
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi . Were special techniques successful						3	3	6	4.08	447/ 904		4.01	4.03	4.01	
I. Wele Special coo	amingaes saccessian		3	2	Ü	_	5	J	Ü	1.00	11/, 501	1.05	1.01	1.05	1.01	1.00
		Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ation	1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301 University of Maryland Page 737 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: MABE, MITZI J

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1511/1670	4.14	4.16	4.31	4.32	3.6
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	1582/1666	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.27	3.2
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	4.31	4.42	4.32	4.39	4.3
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	910/1615	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.2
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	5	1	1	2.89	1515/1566	3.76	4.16	4.07	4.00	2.8
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	832/1528	4.34	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.1
Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1633/1650	3.60	4.06	4.22	4.20	2.2
. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	922/1667	4.59	4.50	4.67	4.64	4.7
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 2	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1240/1626	4.13	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.7
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1451/1559	4.20	4.32	4.46	4.40	3.5
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1188/1560	4.79	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1261/1549	4.42	4.33	4.31	4.25	3.
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	1	0	3	3.43	1404/1546	4.06	4.26	4.32	4.30	3.
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin	.g 4	1	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	1099/1323	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.08	3.3
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	. 3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	570/1384	4.45	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.3
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	. 3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1378	4.76	4.47	4.29	4.25	4.
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	4.61	4.54	4.31	4.26	5.
Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	461/ 904	4.03	4.01	4.03	4.01	4.
Seminar														
. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	5.00	**
. Was the instructor available for individual attentio	n 10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.75	* *
Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.25	**
Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.95	* *
Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80		4.33	3.97	4.30	* *
Fr	equency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	les			Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3

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

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101 University of Maryland Page 738 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Questions				NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion	ь 		1417													
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	1150/1670	4.39	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.12
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	919/1666	4.51	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.29
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	940/1406	4.45	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.18
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	898/1615	4.53	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.24
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	599/1566	4.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.29
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	670/1528	4.51	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.29
		system clearl		ined	1	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	1107/1650	4.39	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.06
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	3	6			1340/1667			4.67		4.29
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	659/1626	4.41	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.31
	Lecture																	
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	1	0	4			946/1559			4.46		4.46
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	1		4.77			4.73	4.72	4.67	4.77
				explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	4		4.33		4.56		4.31	4.25	4.33
		s contribute t		•	7	0	0	1	1	1		4.45				4.32	4.24	
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	2	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	990/1323	3.44	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.60
		Discus																
سات المات 1					0	0	0	1	1	2	_	4 20	710/1204	1 11	4 20	1 10	4 10	4 00
				what you learneded to participate	8	0	0	1 0	1	0	9	4.20	712/1384 1/1378	4.41 4.75	4.28	4.10 4.29	4.12	4.20
				ed to participate id open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1		4.89	,			4.29	4.30	5.00
		chniques succe		d open discussion	9 9	0	0	0	1	4		4.33	,			4.03	4.03	
4. Were sp	peciai te	cimiques succe	SSLUI		9	U	U	U	1	4	4	4.33	320/ 904	3.94	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.33
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0															
Grad.							ectiv	res				0	#### - :				_	rh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt			

Other

14

0

0

I ? Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201 University of Maryland Page 739 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

SMITH, ORIANNE

Instructor: Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	401/1670	4.39	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	344/1666	4.51	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	399/1406	4.45	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	357/1615	4.53	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	132/1566	4.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	d 0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	167/1528	4.51	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	395/1650	4.39	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	675/1667	4.71	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	308/1626	4.41	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	307/1559	4.64	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	4.92	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	266/1549	4.56	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	139/1546	4.63	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	3	1	2	1	2	2.78	1245/1323	3.44	3.76	4.00	3.99	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	221/1384	4.41	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	348/1378	4.75	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0		1	2	12	4.73	460/1378	4.82	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful			1	1	2	0	6	3.90	570/ 904		4.01	4.03	4.03	3.90
Fre	quency	/ Di	stri	butio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	A Expected Grades								T·ν	ne			Maiors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301 University of Maryland Page 740 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR Spring 2008

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

					r r	eque.	пстег	3		Inst	ructor	Course	рерс	UMBC	телет	sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	902/1670	4.39	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.33
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	622/1666	4.51	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	1	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	597/1406	4.45	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	357/1615	4.53	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.69
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	218/1566	4.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.76
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	546/1528	4.51	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.41
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	615/1650	4.39	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.47
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	405/1667	4.71	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	681/1626	4.41	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.29
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	809/1559	4.64	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.57
					4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	683/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	4.50
	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	715/1546	4.63	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.50
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	794/1323	3.44	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.93
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	683/1384	4.41	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.23
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	9		649/1378		4.47	4.29	4.30	
		_	_	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0		11		344/1378				4.33	
		echniques succe		a open alboablen	5	0	1	1	5	2			712/ 904					
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
				-														
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ge:	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	2	_		_			
				s 0														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101 University of Maryland Page 741 Title ART OF THE ESSAY AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24				
Questionnaires:	16	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 1

	Quantitative and the second se						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	531/1670	4.63	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.63
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	542/1666		4.21	4.27	4.18	4.56
		uestions reflec			0	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.42	4.32	4.22	***
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	660/1615	4.43	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	359/1566	4.56	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.56
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	675/1650	4.44	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.44
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.60
	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	•	-		4 00	040/1550	4 00	4 20	1 16	4 40	4 00
					4	0	0	0	0	1			248/1559			4.46	4.40	
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0				477/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	
					3	0	0	0					161/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	4.92
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	0			4.92	,		4.26	4.32	4.24	4.92
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1323	****	3.76	4.00	3.99	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	152/1384	4.92	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.92
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92			4.47	4.29	4.30	4.92
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	4	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.60
				Frequ	lency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	auir	ed fo	or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	14
28-55						100	-1 00 T T 1	- A I	J_ 1·10	⊥∪ر ـ	2	Ü	Gradat	_	•	1100	-	
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	2
	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0							_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		-
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
0100.	P 0											-	respons				_	.==
						Ot 1	her				1	.1					-	
	I 0																	

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101 University of Maryland Page 742 Title BRIT LIT: MEDIEVAL/RENA Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

Ctudont	Courac	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Scudenc	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescionnaire

	Frequencies							Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1038/1670	4.21	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	2	3.79	1393/1666	3.79	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	964/1406	4.14	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	606/1615	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	258/1566	4.71	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	859/1528	4.07	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	950/1650	4.21	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	7	1	3.64	1644/1667	3.64	4.50	4.67	4.67	3.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	877/1626	4.13	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1337/1559	3.92	4.32	4.46	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	9		1222/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1099/1323	3.33	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	721/1384		4.28	4.10	4.12	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	660/1378	4.45	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	702/1378	4.45	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	852/ 904	2.80	4.01	4.03	4.03	2.80
Frequ	onat	Diat	- r i bı	ı+i or	2									

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101

BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA

Title

Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 743 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eva.	luation	Questi	onnaire.
---------	--------	------	---------	--------	----------

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	-	2	0	0.0	4 50	500/1650	4 50	4 16	4 21	4 0 4	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1 1	3	2	20 19	4.58 4.54	589/1670 582/1666			4.31		4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	20	4.54		4.54 4.54	4.21 4.42	4.27 4.32	4.18 4.22	4.54 4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	20	4.54		4.54	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	302/1515	4.65	4.16	4.07	4.18	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	3	18	4.50		4.50	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	,		4.06	4.22	4.12	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69			4.50	4.67	4.67	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	11	11	4.50				4.11		4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	21	4.79	452/1559		4.32	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	21	4.79	308/1549	4.79	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	5	18	4.63		4.63	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1323	****	3.76	4.00	3.99	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	364/1384	4.62	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	,	4.43	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95				4.31		4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	6	5	7	3.89	573/ 904			4.03		3.89
Laboratory							_							
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	***
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.68	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
•									,					

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 21

I

University of Maryland Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101 Baltimore County Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO

AUG 6, 2008 FERNANDEZ, JEAN Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Page 744

Enrollment:	32	
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

F 0

P 0

0

I 0

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 5

							Fre	equer	ncie	g		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA		_	3	4	5				_		Mean	
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did you	ı dəin ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4 39	835/1670	4 39	4 16	4.31	4.24	4 39
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	6	5	6		1331/1666		4.21	4.27	4.18	3.89
		estions reflec			0	0	1	4	2	5	6		1247/1406		4.42	4.32		3.61
	_	ations reflect			1	1	0	1	3	2	10	4.31			4.31	4.24	4.18	4.31
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14		210/1566			4.07	4.04	
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11		383/1528				4.07	
	. Was the grading system clearly explained				0	0	0	3	3	3	9		1135/1650		4.06	4.22	4.12	4.00
	How many times was class cancelled				0	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1498/1667	4.06	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.06
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectives				1	0	0	0	7	6			1200/1626		4.14	4.11	4.06	3.82
	. 5																	
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	L. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				7	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1062/1559	4.36	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.36
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1214/1560	4.55	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.55
				explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1036/1549	4.18	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.18
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.80
		Discus																
				what you learned	2		0	0	1			4.75	- ,				4.12	4.75
				ed to participate	2		0	1	0			4.50					4.30	
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	615/1378	4.56	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.56
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	ne			Majors				
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad																		
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	в 10														
56-83						Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Crad	0	2 50 4 00	E .	₽ ∩		רים -	~+ i +	700				Λ	####	Moana +	horo a	ro not	000110	_r h

Electives

Other

0

15

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR Spring 2008 STEWART, CAROLE Instructor:

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 23

Page 745 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

O +	a	Evaluation	0	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestroi	шатге

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
01														
General	_	0	-	-	_	_	1.0	4 00	1100/1600	4 00	4 16	4 21	4 0 4	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Τ	Τ	3	8	10		1172/1670			4.31	4.24	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	12		1015/1666	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	576/1406	4.52	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	390/1615	4.65	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	154/1566	4.87	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	462/1528	4.48	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	485/1650	4.57	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	338/1667	4.96	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	10	4	3.76	1247/1626	3.76	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	784/1559	4.59	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	5	14	4.36	864/1549	4.36	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1092/1323	3.36	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	503/1378	4.64	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	20	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	3	0	6	6	5	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.50
-														
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101 University of Maryland Page 746 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 27

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	9	15	4.37	849/1670	4.37	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	15	4.26	967/1666	4.26	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/1406	****	4.42	4.32	4.22	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	8	16	4.46	606/1615	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	23	4.74	234/1566	4.74	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	17	4.48	448/1528	4.48	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	20	4.59	443/1650	4.59	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	786/1667	4.85	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	11	10	4.26	716/1626	4.26	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	2	18	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	1	22	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	0	8	13	4.30	936/1549	4.30	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	2	18	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	4	3	2	15	4.17	612/1323	4.17	3.76	4.00	3.99	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	Λ	2	4	3	15	4.29	644/1384	4.29	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	20	4.64	495/1378	4.64	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	550/1378	4.64	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	3	8	4	6	3.39	763/ 904	3.39	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.39
1. Hold Special Committees Successful	-	-	_	3	J	-	Ü	3.33	.05, 501	3.37	1.01	1.05	1.03	3.33
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	20	_			
				2	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 314 0101

11

TOPICS IN DRAMA

FALCO, RAPHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2008

Page 747 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	490/1666		4.21	4.27	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	495/1406		4.42	4.32	4.22	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.16	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	. 0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	4.89	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	482/1546	4.70	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1323	****	3.76	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	768/ 904	3.38	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.38
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5														

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

University of Maryland Page 748
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 320 0101

18

TOPICS IN CT

WEXLER, LAURA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

Quoboronno				Soudene cou			uu 0 = 0	J-1 Q				-						
	Frequencies									;		Inst	ructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	-		4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
1 541		Genera		4.1- 2	^	0	_	-	0	4	1.0	4 52	620/167	0 4 52	4 16	4 21	4 04	4 52
		ew insights,ski ctor make clear			0	0 0	0	1 1	0	4	10 6	4.53	632/167				4.24	4.53 4.27
		uestions reflec			0		0	0	0	0	1		955/166 ****/140			4.27 4.32	4.18 4.22	4.2/ ****
		uestions reflect uations reflect			0	14 0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	687/161			4.24	4.22	4.40
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.40	187/156			4.24	4.18	4.40
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	173/152			4.12	4.04	4.80
		g system clearl			0	0	2	1	5	2	5		1477/165			4.22	4.12	3.47
		was class cand		ainea	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/166			4.67	4.67	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	10		379/162			4.11		4.53
9. HOW WOL	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective							U	4	3	10	4.55	3/9/102	0 4.55	4.14	4.11	4.00	4.55
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	755/155	9 4.62	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.62	
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/156	0 4.92	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.92	
3. Was led	cture mat	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/154	9 4.85	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.85		
			2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	582/154	6 4.62	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.62		
5. Did aud	 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understar 						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/132	3 ****	3.76	4.00	3.99	****
		D																
1 Did ala	ana dina	Discus		what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	205/138	4 4.83	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.83
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.92				4.29	4.30	4.92
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.75	439/137				4.33	4.75
		echniques succe		id Open discussion	3	3	0	0	1	4	-	4.33						
T. WEIE BE	peciai c	ecimiques succe	BBLUI		J	J	U	U	_	-	1	1.55	320/ 90	1 1.55	4.01	1.03	4.03	1.55
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld expe	rience contribu	te to v	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 4	1 ****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you	u clearly	y understand yo	ur eva	luation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	8 ****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the	e instru	ctor available	for cor	nsultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	8 ****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss you	ır evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	9 ****	****	4.27	4.38	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
a 1'. =	,							_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons										; 			T.	уре 			Majors 	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7							ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Gradua	te	0	Majo	or	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 5	1											_		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	C 0							7	Under-	grad	15	Non-	-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1		Means				gh
				P 0									respon	ses to	be sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0											6						
				0 1														

? 1

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101 University of Maryland Page 749 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	876/1670	4.35	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	846/1666	4.35	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	435/1406	4.65	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	7	4.21	686/1566	4.21	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	240/1528	4.74	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	1020/1650	4.16	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	16	0	3.84	1618/1667	3.84	4.50	4.67	4.67	3.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	659/1626	4.32	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	572/1559	4.72	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	1004/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	762/1549	4.44	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1194/1546	3.94	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1269/1323	2.50	3.76	4.00	3.99	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	476/1384	4.47	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	197/1378	4.93	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.67
P														

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101 University of Maryland STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH Baltimore County

Title Spring 2008 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 15

	Ouestionnaire

Page 750 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	equei	ncie	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	N	ΙA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0		0	0	0	6	3	6	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		0	0	2	6	2	5	3.67	1452/1666	3.67	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0		0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1108/1406	3.93	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0		3	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1550/1615	3.17	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0		0	5	0	4	2	4	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 0		0	3	5	2	2	3	2.80	1489/1528	2.80	4.35	4.12	4.07	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0		0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.93	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 3		0	2	0	3	7	0	3.25	1491/1626	3.25	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.25
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2		0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1423/1559	3.69	4.32	4.46	4.40	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2		0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1279/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2		0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1405/1549	3.46	4.33	4.31	4.25	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2		0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1256/1546	3.85	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	g 2	1	.0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1323	****	3.76	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3		0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1231/1384	3.17	4.28	4.10	4.12	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3		0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1247/1378	3.33	4.47	4.29	4.30	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 3		0	3	3	4	0	2	2.58	1347/1378	2.58	4.54	4.31	4.33	2.58
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	.0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.01	4.03	4.03	****
Fr	equenc	v D)ist	ribu	ıtioı	ı									
		-													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	es				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4			Req	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	13
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4															

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 331 0101 University of Maryland Page 751 AUG 6, 2008 Title CONTEMPORARY BRITISH L Baltimore County

FERNANDEZ, JEAN Instructor:

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

3

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Spring 2008

				Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	иерt	UMBC	rever	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1458/1670	3.73	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.73
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1525/1666	3.45	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.45
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1250/1406	3.60	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.60
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1418/1615	3.60	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	715/1566	4.18	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.18
6. Did wr:	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1328/1528	3.40	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.40
		system clearl			0	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1556/1650	3.18	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.18
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1210/1626	3.82	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.82
		Lectur	Α															
1 Were th	he instru		_	prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4 00	1280/1559	4.00	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.00
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subjec					0	0	0	2	1	7		1248/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	4.50
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject. . Was lecture material presented and explained cle				1	0	0	1	2	3	4		1146/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	4.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained cle Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	2	0	3	5		1103/1546		4.26	4.32	4.24	4.10
				our understanding	1	8	1	0	1	0	0		****/1323		3.76	4.00	3.99	****
J. DIG au	aiovisuai	ceciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	1	0	1	U	1	U	U	2.00	/1323		3.70	4.00	3.99	
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3		4.00			4.28	4.10	4.12	4.00
		_	_	ed to participate	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	,		4.47	4.29	4.30	4.20
		_		d open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30			4.54	4.31	4.33	4.30
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		1	3	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	752/ 904	3.43	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.43
Fr						Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe.			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajors	3	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 0					Ge	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	2	
84-150	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
	aa. 0 3.50-4.00 / F 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

I 0

? 2

Course-Section: ENGL 349 0101 University of Maryland Page 752 Title THE BIBLE AND LITERATU Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL Spring 2008

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 22

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions								_	ncies	5			tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	1003/1666	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.23
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	352/1406	4.73	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.73
4. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	1	0	6	14	4.41	687/1615	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.41
5. Did ass	igned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	21	4.82	181/1566	4.82	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.82
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	651/1528	4.32	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.32
7. Was the	grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	513/1650	4.55	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.55
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	7	15		1002/1667	4.68	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	8	9	4.15	843/1626	4.15	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.15
1 Mars + la		Lectur			2	^	0	0	1	_	1 /	4 (5	600/1550	4 (5	4 20	1 10	4 40	4 65
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				2	0	0	0	T	0	14 20	4.65	689/1559 1/1560	4.65 5.00	4.32 4.73	4.46	4.40 4.67	4.65
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 				2	0	0	1	0	7	12	5.00 4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00 4.50
		es contribute t			2	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	715/1549		4.33	4.31	4.24	4.50
				your understanding	2	9	3	1	1	3	3		1149/1323		3.76	4.00		3.18
J. Dia aua	iiovisuai	r ceciminques en	nance j	our understanding	2	,	J	_		J	J	3.10	1149/1323	3.10	3.70	4.00	3.99	3.10
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ss discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	6	12	4.24	683/1384	4.24	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.24
2. Were al	.l studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	2	0	1	3	15	4.38	768/1378	4.38	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	1	2	1	4	6	6	3.68	662/ 904	3.68	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.68
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	า									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 7																		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	12	
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 10					a		1			-	1	TTm day		2	Mar		1.0	
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 4						nera.	L			Τ	1	Under-g	raa 2	2	Non-	major	10
84-150	4-150 7 3.00-3.49 5 D 0																	

Electives

Other

2

5

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 369 0101 University of Maryland
Title RACE ETHNICITY US LIT Baltimore County
Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

20

Page 753 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fr	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	835/1670	4.38	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.38
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear the	e expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	908/1666	4.31	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.31
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflect th	ne expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.42	4.32	4.22	***
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect the	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	606/1615	4.46	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.46
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	218/1566	4.77	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.77
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contribut	e to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	398/1528	4.54	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.54
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly ex	plained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	327/1650	4.69	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.69
8. How m	any times	was class cancelle	ed	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How w	ould you	grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	905/1626	4.09	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.09
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures we	ell prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	572/1559	4.73	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.73
		ctor seem intereste		2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.91
			nd explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	634/1549	4.55	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.55
		es contribute to wh	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	667/1546	4.55	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.55
			e your understanding	2	4	2	1	0	4	0	2.86	1234/1323	2.86	3.76	4.00	3.99	2.86
		Discussion	1														
1. Did c	lass disc		to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	348/1384	4.64	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.64
			raged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	898/1378	4.18	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.18
		_	and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	560/1378	4.64	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.64
		echniques successfu	_	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	361/ 904	4.27	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.27
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	ne			Majors	
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 3 B 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	8

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101 University of Maryland Page 754 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

I

1

0

0

0

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you gain n	new insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	862/1670	4.36	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.36
2. Did t	the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	703/1666	4.45	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.45
4. Did o	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.70
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contribu	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1566	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.45
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1528	4.91	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.91
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	879/1650	4.27	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.27
8. How r	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1287/1667	4.36	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.44
		Lecture	e															
1. Were	the instr			prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.70
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was I	lecture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.80
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques enl	hance y	our understanding	1	2	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.76	4.00	3.99	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1384	4.78	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.78
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.89	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Were	special t	echniques succes	ssful	-	2	3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	594/ 904	3.83	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.83
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	ı									
				•	-													
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_			-						_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	7
84-150																	-	

Electives

Other

2

2

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101

Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR

Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 755 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				NR	NA	Fro	eque 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 1		General	. 1 . 1	0	•	•	0	0	_	_	4 50	665 /1650	4 50	4 16	4 21	4 0 4	4 50
_	-	ew insights, skills fro		0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	,			4.31		4.50
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0 3	0	0	0 1	4 2	6 4	4.60 4.43	490/1666		4.21	4.27	4.18	4.60 4.43
	_	uestions reflect the e		0	1	0	0	0	4		4.43			4.42	4.34	4.22	4.43
		uations reflect the ex eadings contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	187/1566		4.16	4.24	4.18	4.80
	_	signments contribute to	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80			4.35	4.12	4.04	4.80
		g system clearly expla		0	0	1	1	1	2	5		1278/1650		4.06	4.22	4.12	3.90
	_	was class cancelled	inea	1	0	0	0	0	5			1216/1667		4.50	4.67	4.67	4.44
		grade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1			131/1626				4.06	
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.50
		ctor seem interested i		0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	4.90
		terial presented and e		2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	4.63
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	2	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.76	4.00	3.99	4.00
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were a	all stude:	nts actively encourage	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were s	special t	echniques successful		3	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.01	4.03	4.03	5.00
		Laboratory															
		ded with adequate back		8	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 239		****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were n	necessary	materials available f	or lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
		Seminar															
2. Was th	ne instru	ctor available for ind	lividual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.53	****
		Field Work							_								
	_	rience contribute to w	_	9	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did yo	ou clearl	y understand your eval	uation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
		Self Paced															
	_	system contribute to	-	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
		tions make clear the e ugh proctors for all t	_	9	0	0	1	0	0 1	0		****/ 16 ****/ 6		****	4.67 4.92	4.00	****
												, -					
			Frequ	ıency	, Dis.	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 4		~ .		7				2	тт. Э		0	37		-
56-83 84-150	0 3	2.00-2.99 2 3.00-3.49 3	C 0		Ge	nera	Т				2	Under-g	raa 1	.0	Non-	-major	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	jh
			Р 1 т 0		O+-1	h o					1	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
	P I				Ut.	her					4						

Course-Section: ENGL 379 0101

Title PRINS/PRACT IN TECH CO

Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 756 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	naira

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	5	6		1105/1670	4.15	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	2	4		1549/1666	3.38	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3		****/1406	****	4.42	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1203/1615	3.92	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	3		4.07	808/1566	4.07	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3		4.36	611/1528	4.36	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	2			1425/1650	3.62		4.22	4.12	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	7			1246/1667	4.42	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1181/1626	3.85	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.85
Lecture				_			_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	1	4	3		1471/1559	3.45		4.46	4.40	3.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	8		1214/1560	4.55	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	1			1379/1549	3.55	4.33		4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3			1268/1546	3.82		4.32	4.24	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	894/1323	3.80	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	0	7	3.75	996/1384	3.75	4.28	4.10	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1378	4.58	4.54		4.33	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	629/ 904	3.75	4.01	4.03		3.75
1. Were special econniques successful	_	-	Ü	-	_	_	5	3.73	025/ 501	3.75	1.01	1.05	1.05	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	***	4.19	4.04	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	***	4.21	3.99	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	***	4.44	4.25	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.68	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
minia di manda														
Field Work	1 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	1 11	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	-	0	0	0	1		,	****	****		4.44	****
 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Was the instructor available for consultation 	13	0	0	0					****/ 38 ****/ 38	****	****	4.19 4.62	3.96	****
	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****		4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 31	****	****	4.27	4.38 4.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 31			4.4/	4.51	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 379 0101 Title

PRINS/PRACT IN TECH CO

Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 756 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101 University of Maryland Page 757 AUG 6, 2008 INTRO TO NEWS WRITING Baltimore County Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH Spring 2008

Enrollment: 21 Ouestionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

56-83

Grad.

84-150

2

4

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

5

C 2

D 0

Ρ

I

0

0

0

1

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	1017/1670	4.24	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	919/1666	4.29	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	8	2	3.24	1415/1566	3.24	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	546/1528	4.41	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	1541/1650	3.25	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	9	0	3.64	1323/1626	3.64	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12		855/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	736/1549	4.47	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	1079/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	2	5	0	3	3.40	1082/1323	3.40	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1223/1384	3.18	4.28	4.10	4.12	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	3	3	3		1178/1378		4.47	4.29	4.30	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	856/1378	4.27	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 904	****	4.01	4.03	4.03	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2	2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major					13								
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 9														

General

Other

Electives

2

11

Under-grad 17

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101

25

FEATURE WRITING

CORBETT, CHRIS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2008

Page 758

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fr		equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	765/1670	4.44	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	821/1666	4.38	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.42	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	660/1615	4.43	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	2	3	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	141/1528	4.87	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1494/1650	3.43	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	946/1667	4.73	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	693/1626	4.29	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1237/1559	4.13	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1079/1546	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1323	****	3.76	4.00	3.99	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	560/1384	4.38	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	306/1378	4.85	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	225/1378	4.92	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9	Required for Majors 1				Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	8				

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 386 0101 University of Maryland Page 759 Title ADULT LITERACY TUTORIN Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

MCCARTHY, LUCIL Spring 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eaue	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	. Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	414/1670	4.71	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.71
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.16	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.57
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	307/1650	4.71	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.71
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.32	4.46	4.40	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	4		1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
	<u> </u>						0	0	0	1	3	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.75
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.12	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.75
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credita F:	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.e.	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	•
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad										, 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В 1														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2 Ur			Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	4					
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	D 0													
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El€	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2						

? 0

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101 University of Maryland Page 760 Title WEB DESIGN & AUTHORING Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ο	0	0	Λ	1	6	12	4.58	589/1670	4.58	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	595/1666	4.53	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	673/1615	4.41	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	2	4	5		1419/1566	3.22	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	6	4	3.67	1202/1528	3.67	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1236/1667	4.42	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	854/1626	4.14	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture	_	_		_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	796/1559	4.58	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	835/1546	4.42	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.76	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	953/1384	3.86	4.28	4.10	4.12	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	842/1378	4.29	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	850/1378	4.29	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.01	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 18 0 0					0	0	1		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Frequ	Frequency Distribution													

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0	FIECTIVES		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101 University of Maryland Page 761 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1139/1670	4.12	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	1	4			1409/1666		4.21	4.27		3.75
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1147/1406		4.42	4.32	4.22	3.88
	_	uations reflect			1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	990/1615	4.29	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.14
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	851/1566	3.77	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	706/1528	4.45	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	1	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1304/1650	4.11	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.86
8. How man	3. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven					0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1062/1667	4.76	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.63
9. How wo	O. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven					0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626	4.12	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.14
		Lectur																
1. Were tl	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.52	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.63
	2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1070/1549	4.14	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.14
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1345/1546	4.02	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.63
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.76	4.00	3.99	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1013/1384	4.12	4.28	4.10	4.12	3.71
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	842/1378	4.60	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	731/1378	4.63	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.43
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	essful		2	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904	4.26	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.50
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Guadita Farmad Guadan GDD Farmantad Guadan								_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	3 -			Ту:	pe 			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	- 1					r	4							
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA Spring 2008

Enrollment:

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

1

5

5

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

3

3

В

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

10

5

0

0

0

0

0

Ouestionnaires: 19

27

University of Maryland Page 762

Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

0

19

Under-grad 19

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major

Student Cou	ırse Evaluat	ion Questi	ionnaire
-------------	--------------	------------	----------

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	10	2	3.53	1531/1670	4.12	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	8	3	3.44	1529/1666	3.93	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	4.34	4.42	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	3	8	3.89	1246/1615	4.29	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	1	4	3	4	2.89	1515/1566	3.77	4.16	4.07	4.04	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	5	10	4.16	796/1528	4.45	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	5	6	3.58	1439/1650	4.11	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	983/1667	4.76	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	5	7	1	3.47	1405/1626	4.12	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1280/1559	4.52	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	1271/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	1308/1549	4.14	4.33	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	5	2	6	3.63	1345/1546	4.02	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	4.00	3.76	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	820/1384	4.12	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	692/1378	4.63	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	718/ 904	4.26	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.50
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4	Required for Majors 0 Graduate				 e	0	 Majo	 r	11					

General

Other

Electives

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

19

University of Maryland Page 763
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	427/1670	4.12	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	516/1666	3.93	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	261/1406	4.34	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	231/1615	4.29	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	480/1566	3.77	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	73/1528	4.45	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	173/1650	4.11	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	405/1667	4.76	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	207/1626	4.12	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	193/1559	4.52	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	646/1549	4.14	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	345/1546	4.02	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1323	4.00	3.76	4.00	3.99	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	348/1384	4.12	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.60	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.63	4.54	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	138/ 904		4.01	4.03	4.03	4.78
Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Reasons Type			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	9	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	13	_				
				2	0							

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 0101	University of Maryland	Page
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	AUG 6,

ge 764 , 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment:	3	
Ouestionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1486/1670	4.29	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.29	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	775/1615	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.64	4.35	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1404/1650	3.97	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.80	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.39	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.67

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

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 0201	University of Maryland	Page 765
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:	BENSON, LINDA K	Spring 2008	Job IRBR3029

Course-Section.	ENGL 392 0201	University of Maryland	Pa
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	AUG
Instructor:	BENSON, LINDA K	Spring 2008	Job I
- 11	4		

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions					1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new i	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	4.29	4.16	4.31	4.24	5.00		
2. Did the instructor	make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.29	4.21	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam quest	ions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluati	ons reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.18	5.00
6. Did written assign	ments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.64	4.35	4.12	4.07	5.00
		Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Spring 2008 BENSON, LINDA K

Instructor:

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Page 766 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies			3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.29	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.29	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.18	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.64	4.35	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	3.97	4.06	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	4.80	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.39	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.67	4.32	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	4.83	4.33	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	4.83	4.26	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.76	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.92	4.28	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.33	5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Spring 2008

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 767

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		- <u>-</u>		Inst	ructor	Course Dept				Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	902/1670	4.29	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.29	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.42	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.16	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.64	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	3.97	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.80	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.39	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.33
Tarkuna														
Lecture	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	1 /1 5 5 0	4 67	4 20	1 10	4 40	г оо
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	1/1559		4.32	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/1546	4.83	4.26	4.32	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.92	4.28	4.10	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904	4.75	4.01	4.03	4.03	4.50
Frequ	ency.	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501 University of Maryland Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 768

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.29	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		415/1666		4.21	4.27	4.18	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615		4.31	4.24	4.18	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.64	4.35	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1135/1650	3.97	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1022/1667	4.80	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.39	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.92	4.28	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.83	4.65	4.30	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	4.50	4.38	4.64	4.53	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 75	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.50	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	62/ 79	3.50	4.00	4.45	3.68	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	4.33	3.97	3.76	4.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0601 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING FALLON, MICHAEL Spring 2008

Instructor: Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 769

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ο	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.29	4 16	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666		4.21	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406		4.42	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.18	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	n	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528		4.35	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	0		1460/1650		4.06	4.22	4.12	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	4.80	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	637/1626		4.14	4.11	4.06	4.33
y. non would jou grade one everall deadning erredereness	Ū	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	ŭ	_	1.55	007,1020	1.55			1.00	1.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.67	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1248/1560	4.83	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	683/1549	4.83	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.83	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384		4.28	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378		4.54	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	4.75	4.01	4.03	4.03	5.00
Frequ		Dist	crib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section	: ENGL 392 1201	University of Maryland	Page 770
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:	FITZPATRICK, CA	Spring 2008	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA Spring 2008 Enrollment: 5

Ouestionnaires: 1

Ouestions	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					Instructor 5 Mean Rank		Course Dept Mean Mean				Sect Mean		
Quescions	1414							Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1620/1670	4.29	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1603/1666	4.29	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.67	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1447/1528	4.64	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.97	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.39	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 79	4.50	4.38	4.64	4.53	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 75	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.50	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 75/ 79 3.50 4.00 4.45 3.68 3.00

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101 University of Maryland Page 771
Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 23

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnai:	aire

Questions

		Genera	.1																
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this cour	se	0	0	0	2	1	8	2	3.77	1436/1670	3.53	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.77
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goal	S	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	808/1666	3.90	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goa	ls	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.75
4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goal	s	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	379/1615	4.03	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you le	arned	0	0	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	1225/1566	3.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.62
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you	learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	421/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined		1	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	769/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.36
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled			1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effect	iveness	1	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1191/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.83
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared		3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	772/1559	3.91	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subje	ct	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	855/1560	4.37	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained cl	early	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	562/1549	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned		3	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	1032/1546	3.65	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.20
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our underst	anding	4	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	545/1323	3.73	3.76	4.00	3.99	4.25
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you le	arned	9	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	996/1384	3.69	4.28	4.10	4.12	3.75
		nts actively en				9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1193/1378	4.08	4.47	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open disc	ussion	9	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1276/1378	3.91	4.54	4.31	4.33	3.25
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful	_		9	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	3.40	4.01	4.03	4.03	****
					Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4		Rec	 mire	ed fo	or Ma	 aior		0	Graduate	· – – – – - ·	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6)	. ~	-	or addage	-	-			-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-gr	ad 1	.3	Non-	-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0								-			-		5	
Grad.					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - N	leans t	here a	are not	enous	ηh		
	-	2.22 2.00	-	P	0								-	response				_	,
				I	0		Oth	ner				1	2					-	
				?	1		0.01					_	_						
				•	_														

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland Page 772 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

C+ud.	ont Course	Erraluation	Ouestionnaire
Stude	ent Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201

24

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1583/1670	3.53	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1452/1666	3.90	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1294/1615	4.03	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1428/1566	3.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1039/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1388/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1334/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	1	1	4	3.67	1312/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1352/1559	3.91	4.32	4.46	4.40	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1508/1560	4.37	4.73	4.72	4.67	3.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	1237/1549	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.25	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1411/1546	3.65	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	820/1323	3.73	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.90
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.40	4.01	4.03	4.03	****
Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
•	-													

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				2	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 773

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

				Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	4	2	7	3	1	2 71	1648/1670	3.53	4.16	4.31	4.24	2.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	4	5	2	4		1595/1666		4.21	4.27	4.18	3.12
		uestions reflec			0	16	0	0	0	1	0		****/1406		4.42	4.32	4.22	****
	_	uations reflect			0	1	0	3	4	3	6	3.75	1325/1615		4.31	4.24	4.18	3.75
				what you learned	1	13	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1566	3.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	***
				what you learned	1	1	2	0	5	3	5	3.60	1233/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.60
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	3	3	5	3	2	2.88	1604/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	2.88
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	1524/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	1	5	8	2	0	2.69	1585/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	2.69
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	1	8	7	0		1485/1559			4.46	4.40	3.38
		ctor seem inter		3	1	0	0	2	5	7	2		1521/1560		4.73	4.72	4.67	3.56
		_		xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	6	6	3		1358/1549		4.33	4.31	4.25	3.63
		es contribute t		•	1	0	3	4	4	3	2		1505/1546		4.26	4.32	4.24	2.81
5. Did av	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	3	3	6	4	3.69	950/1323	3.73	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.69
		- ·																
ו הנת ו		Discus			1 2	0	2	0	2	0	0	2 00	++++/120/	2 (0	4 00	1 10	1 10	***
				what you learned	13 13	0	2	0	2	0	0		****/1384 ****/1378			4.10	4.12 4.30	****
				d to participate d open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	0	1		****/1378				4.30	****
3. DIG ti	ie instiu	ctor encourage	Iair an	a open discussion	13	U	U	1	2	U	Т	3.45	/13/6	3.91	4.54	4.31	4.33	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
a 1'	. ,	a an-						_					_					
Credits E	sarned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 14		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	;	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	17
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means t							_	h										
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.3						
				3 0														

Baltimore County Spring 2008

University of Maryland

Page 774

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	26	
Questionnaires:	19	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401

TECHNICAL WRITING

ROCKETT, DANIKA

Title

Instructor:

Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean			
			- 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	n this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	13	4.47	708/1670	3.53	4.16	4.31	4.24	4.47
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	291/1666	3.90	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.78
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	9	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	495/1406	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.60
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	217/1615	4.03	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.84
	_	_		vhat you learned	1	0	2	0	2	5	9	4.06	820/1566	3.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.06
		_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	250/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.72
		system clearly		ined	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	263/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.76
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	10	8		1216/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.44
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	355/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.56
		Lecture	_															
		ctor's lecture:		_	0	0	0	0	0		15	4.79	469/1559	3.91		4.46	4.40	4.79
		tor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	4.37	4.73	4.72	4.67	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0			4.89	211/1549	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.89
		s contribute to			0	0	1	0	0			4.58	631/1546		4.26	4.32	4.24	4.58
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	6	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	507/1323	3.73	3.76	4.00	3.99	4.31
		- ·																
1 544		Discus		3	10	0	0	^	0	_	-	4 70	040/1204	2 60	4 00	4 10	4 10	4 70
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	7		,		4.28	4.10	4.12	4.78
				d to participate	10	-	0	0	1	0		4.78	379/1378	4.08	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.78 4.78
		chniques succes		d open discussion	10 10	0 3	0	0	3	2 1		4.78	417/1378 594/ 904		4.54 4.01	4.31	4.33	3.83
4. were sp	peciai te	cimiques succes	SSIUI		10	3	U	U	3	Т	4	3.83	594/ 904	3.40	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.83
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 10					Re	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			_											
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C 1		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0			Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h			
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.7						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 775 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	3	2	8	5	2 55	1524/1670	3.53	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	5	9		1318/1666	3.90	4.10	4.27	4.18	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	0	1	4	5		1169/1406	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	8	7		1349/1615	4.03	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	1	4	9		1205/1566	3.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	6	12	4.24	724/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	4	6	8	3.90	1278/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	20	4.81	861/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	0	2	10	3	3.56	1365/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	5	4	10	3.95	1316/1559	3.91	4.32	4.46	4.40	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	2	2	15	4.33	1376/1560	4.37	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	2	7	8		1285/1549	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.25	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	2	6	8		1361/1546	3.65	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	1	8	4	3	3.16	1158/1323	3.73	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	2	1		****/1384	3.69	4.28	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	0	1	2		****/1378	4.08	4.47	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	0	3		****/1378	3.91	4.54	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	****/ 904	3.40	4.01	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	***	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0			****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501
Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 775 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601

TECHNICAL WRITING

Title Instructor: HESS, LAURIE

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 776 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies			Tnsi	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	4	1	2	2.47	1655/1670	3.53	4.16	4.31	4.24	2.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	3	3	4	3.13	1592/1666	3.90	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	495/1406	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	1	3	4	3.21	1541/1615	4.03	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	0	2	2	4		1440/1566		4.16	4.07	4.04	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	1	5	3.21	1410/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	4	4	4	3.40	1503/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	540/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	9	2	1	3.33	1462/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	3	1	3	2	2.83	1530/1559	3.91	4.32	4.46	4.40	2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	1	7		1467/1560	4.37	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	4	0	2	3		1510/1549	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.25	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	0	2	3		1517/1546		4.26	4.32	4.24	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	1	1	2	3		1173/1323		3.76	4.00	3.99	3.10
Dismonism														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	2	2	1	2 00	1260/1384	3.69	4.28	4.10	4.12	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	2	2		1074/1378	4.08	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2	2	2		1130/1378	3.91	4.54	4.29	4.33	3.71
	9	1	1	1	0	2	_		802/ 904		4.01		4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	Τ	Τ	U	2	1	3.20	802/ 904	3.40	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
mini di manda														
Field Work	1 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	++++/ /1	++++	++++	4 50	1 11	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 41	****		4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38			4.62	4.68	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	***	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601
Title TECHNICAL WRITIN

Title TECHNICAL WRITING Instructor: HESS, LAURIE

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 776 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Page 777 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA

Enrollment:	23		
Questionnaires:	17	Student Course Evaluation	on Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	5	3	4	3.12	1614/1670	3.53	4.16	4.31	4.24	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	3	4	3.18	1586/1666	3.90	4.21	4.27	4.18	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1257/1406	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	2	4	3	3.06	1562/1615	4.03	4.31	4.24	4.18	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	4	3	3.06	1467/1566	3.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	ed 1	0	-	2	4	2	4	3.00	1447/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	1	6	2	2	2.59	1620/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	2.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	14	2	4.00	1524/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 2	1	7	2	2	3	0	2.07	1611/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	2.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	6	4	1	2	2.56	1539/1559	3.91	4.32	4.46	4.40	2.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	1431/1560	4.37	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0		3	5	2	2	2.69	1517/1549	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.25	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	3	2	3	2	2.50	1523/1546	3.65	4.26	4.32	4.24	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	6	3	1	2	4	2.69	1257/1323	3.73	3.76	4.00	3.99	2.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	1	2	2	2	2.58	1328/1384	3.69	4.28	4.10	4.12	2.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1193/1378	4.08	4.47	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	. 5	0	3	1	3	4	1	2.92	1319/1378	3.91	4.54	4.31	4.33	2.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	3	2	1	2	2.80	852/ 904	3.40	4.01	4.03	4.03	2.80
Fre	quenc	y Di:	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s	Reasons						Ту	pe			Majors		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		 Re	 eauir	ed f	 or M	aior	 S	1	 Graduat	 e	0	Maic	 or	3

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901 University of Maryland TECHNICAL WRITING ROCKETT, DANIKA

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Enrollment: 23 Ouestionnaires: 22

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 778

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 10 10 4.32 929/1670 3.53 4.16 4.31 4.24 4.32 0 0 0 1 0 6 15 4.59 503/1666 3.90 4.21 4.27 4.18 4.59 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 495/1406 4.33 4.42 4.32 4.22 4.60 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 8 14 4.64 412/1615 4.03 4.31 4.24 4.18 4.645. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 5 5 12 4.32 579/1566 3.66 4.16 4.07 4.04 4.32 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 6 13 4.45 490/1528 4.01 4.35 4.12 4.07 4.45 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 18 4.77 255/1650 3.88 4.06 4.22 4.12 4.77 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 17 4 4.19 1409/1667 4.51 4.50 4.67 4.67 4.19 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 11 10 4.48 451/1626 3.61 4.14 4.11 4.06 4.48 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 7 15 4.68 640/1559 3.91 4.32 4.46 4.40 4.68 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 20 4.91 596/1560 4.37 4.73 4.72 4.67 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 6 16 4.73 410/1549 3.99 4.33 4.31 4.25 4.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 3 7 12 4.41 849/1546 3.65 4.26 4.32 4.24 4.41 0 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 5 6 8 4.16 619/1323 3.73 3.76 4.00 3.99 4.16 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 5 1 3.44 1125/1384 3.69 4.28 4.10 4.12 3.44 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 672/1378 4.08 4.47 4.29 4.30 4.44 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 2 0 1 6 4.22 883/1378 3.91 4.54 4.31 4.33 4.22 4. Were special techniques successful 13 6 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 904 3.40 4.01 4.03 4.03 **** Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 239 **** 4.21 3.99 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1 5.00 ****/ 87 **** 4.83 4.65 4.30 **** 21 0 0 0 0 0 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.38 4.64 4.53 **** 21 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 **** 4.50 4.57 4.50 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.00 4.45 3.68 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.33 3.97 3.76 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 41 **** *** 4.50 4.44 **** 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.19 3.96 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 0 1 5 00 ****/ 38 **** **** 4.62 4.68 **** 21 0 0 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.27 4.38 **** 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.47 4.51 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.64 3.33 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	

I 0 Other 16 ?

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1001

Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Instructor: SIMS, DIANA

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 779 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	6		1183/1670		4.16	4.31	4.24	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	821/1666	3.90	4.21	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	423/1615	4.03	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	643/1566	3.66	4.16	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	421/1528	4.01	4.35	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	429/1650	3.88	4.06	4.22	4.12	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	730/1667	4.51	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	670/1626	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	858/1559	3.91	4.32	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	855/1560	4.37	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	294/1549	3.99	4.33	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	432/1546		4.26	4.32	4.24	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	507/1323			4.00	3.99	4.31
Discussion	_	0	_	•	-	_	_	4 60	250/1201	2 60	4 00	4 10	4 10	4 60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	372/1384		4.28	4.10	4.12	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	718/1378	4.08	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	590/1378	3.91	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	619/ 904	3.40	4.01	4.03	4.03	3.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.25	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	***	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
-1.11														
Field Work			_											
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1001
Title TECHNICAL WRITING

Instructor: SIMS, DIANA

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 779 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101

17

TECHNICAL WRITING

SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Spring 2008

Page 780

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quoboronn				Doddello coo				, X.		. 01111								
	Frequencies											Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
1 Did 1101	ı gəin ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this sourse	0	0	3	3	0	3	1	2 15	1609/167	0 2 1 5	1 16	4.31	4.24	3.15
		ctor make clear			1	0	2	1	2	3			1564/166		4.10	4.27	4.18	3.33
		estions reflec			0	4	1	3	2	2			1375/140		4.42	4.32	4.22	2.89
	_	ations reflect			0	0	4	0	2	2			1519/161		4.31		4.18	3.31
				what you learned	0	1	5	0	2	1			1527/156		4.16	4.07	4.16	2.75
				to what you learned	0	1	3	2	1	4			1447/152		4.35	4.12	4.07	3.00
		signments contr s system clearl			1	1	1	4	1	1			1536/165		4.06	4.22	4.12	3.27
		was class cand		ziiica	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/166		4.50	4.67	4.67	
				ching effectiveness	3	1	0	3	3	1			1501/162		4.14	4.11	4.06	
J. 110	. La 70a 3	jidas ons overa				-	Ü			_	_	3.22	1001, 102	0 0.22			1.00	3.22
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	3	3	2	2	3	2.92	1526/155	9 2.92	4.32	4.46	4.40	2.92
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	0	0	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	1517/156	0 3.62	4.73	4.72	4.67	3.62
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1474/154	9 3.17	4.33	4.31	4.25	3.17
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	1	3	1	1	2	4	3.27	1438/154	6 3.27	4.26	4.32	4.24	3.27
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	960/132	3 3.67	3.76	4.00	3.99	3.67
1 5441		Discus			4	0	_	-1	4	1	1	0 70	1211/120	4 0 70	4 00	4 10	4 10	0.70
				what you learned	4	0	2	1 1	1	1	Ţ		1311/138		4.28	4.10	4.12	2.78
				ed to participate nd open discussion	4	0	_		_	3			1271/137		4.47		4.30	3.22
		ctor encourage echniques succe		nd open discussion	4	2	1	2	4 1	1 2			1322/137 857/ 90			4.31	4.33	2.89
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succe	SSIUI		4	2	3	U	T	2	1	2./1	857/ 90	4 2./1	4.01	4.03	4.03	2./1
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced			what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 2	8 ****	****	4.64	3.33	***
		ions make clea			12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 1	6 ****	****	4.67	4.00	***
3. Were yo	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 2	7 ****	****	4.54	2.63	***
4. Was the	e feedbac	ck/tutoring by	procto	rs helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 1	0 ****	***	4.84	****	***
				D		- -												
				Frequ	lency	, DIS	tribu	ıtıor	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Т	уре			Majors	;
00.27	0 0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 8		D.	 quire					1	 Gradua	+	1	Majo		0
00-27 28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 8 B 3		Red	quire	ea ro	or Me	ljor	S	1	Gradua	Le	1	мајс)Ľ	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	neral					0	Under-	arad 1	.2	Non-	-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				-				-	011001		_	2.011		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	=		_	P 0										ses to k				•
				I O		Otl	ner					9			5-			

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101 University of Maryland Page 781 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

FERNANDEZ, JEAN

Instructor: 12

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 9

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

1

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4		902/1670			4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3		1331/1666		4.21	4.27	4.35	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	3		1198/1406		4.42	4.32	4.48	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	2	2		1405/1615		4.31	4.24	4.37	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	4		780/1566		4.16	4.07	4.17	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	3		1055/1528		4.35	4.12	4.26	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	3		1445/1650		4.06	4.22	4.28	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	Τ		1465/1667	4.49	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.92	4.14	4.11	4.28	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3 78	1403/1559	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.58	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	6		1294/1560		4.73	4.72	4.80	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	3		1246/1549		4.33	4.31	4.43	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	5		1095/1546		4.26	4.32	4.43	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	1	0			1179/1323		3.76	4.00	4.10	3.00
5. Did dudiovibual ecciniques chiance jour understanding	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	Ü	-	3.00	11/0/1020	3.30	3.70	1.00	1.10	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	777/1384	4.44	4.28	4.10	4.32	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	970/1378	4.42	4.47	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1064/1378	4.40	4.54	4.31	4.60	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	405/ 904	4.46	4.01	4.03	4.22	4.20
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	า									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Pe:	asons				Ty	ne			Majors	
Expected Grades						, 								
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	8
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6														
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	1
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0														

Electives

Other

0

6

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0201 University of Maryland Page 782 Title Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 METHOD OF INTERPRETATI Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

			rreduciiores						11100	Laccor	COULDO	DCPC	OTIDO	TC A C T	DCCC			
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	479/1670	4.50	4.16	4.31	4.45	4.67
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	490/1666	4.24	4.21	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	219/1406	4.32	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.87
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	379/1615	4.15	4.31	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	187/1566	4.46	4.16	4.07	4.17	4.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	300/1528	4.28	4.35	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was th	e gradino	system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1650	4.14	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.73
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	749/1667	4.49	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.87
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll tead	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	637/1626	3.92	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.33
		Lecture	ž															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	355/1559	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.58	4.86
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	3		4.79	892/1560	4.62		4.72		
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	876/1549	4.12	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.36
					1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	631/1546	4.34		4.32		4.57
		ctures contribute to what you learned isual techniques enhance your understand				1	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	612/1323	3.58	3.76	4.00	4.10	4.17
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	257/1384	4.44	4.28	4.10	4.32	4.75
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	316/1378	4.42	4.47	4.29	4.55	4.83
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92		4.40	4.54	4.31	4.60	4.92
		chniques succes			3	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	156/ 904			4.03	4.22	
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
								_					_					
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons				Туј	pe 			Majors 					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0 Unde:		Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	1						
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D 0	· ·													
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Electives 0				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h		

Other

14

Ρ

I

0

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY Spring 2008 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 13

Page 783 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	440/1670	4.69	4.16	4.31	4.45	4.69
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	582/1666	4.54	4.21	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam que		_	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.42	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evalua		_	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.31	4.24	4.37	4.83
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1566	4.92	4.16	4.07	4.17	4.92
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1528	4.85	4.35	4.12	4.26	4.85
7. Was the grading			0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	844/1650	4.31	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.31
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1334/1667	4.31	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.31
9. How would you gr	ade the overall te	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	255/1626	4.69	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.69
	Lecture				_			_	_		005/4550					
1. Were the instruc			4	0	0	0	0	Τ	8	4.89	307/1559		4.32	4.46	4.58	4.89
2. Did the instruct		3	4	0	0	0	0	Τ	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture mate			5	0	0	0	0	1	./	4.88	229/1549		4.33	4.31	4.43	4.88
4. Did the lectures		-	4	0	0	0	0	Τ	8	4.89	253/1546		4.26	4.32	4.43	4.89
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	5	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.76	4.00	4.10	3.50
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	o what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1384	4.89	4.28	4.10	4.32	4.89
2. Were all student	s actively encoura	ged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair	and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	_	4	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/ 904	4.88	4.01	4.03	4.22	4.88
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
		_														
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 410 0101 University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 SEMINAR IN GENRE STUDI Baltimore County Job IRBR3029

Page 784

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Title Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA Spring 2008

? 1

Enr	rollme	ent:	11
			_

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions

		Genera	 1															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.16	4.31	4.45	4.38
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.35	4.43
3. Did th	ıe exam qı	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.42	4.32	4.48	4.60
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.31	4.24	4.37	4.25
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.16	4.07	4.17	4.75
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.35	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	406/1650	4.63	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.50
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.14	4.11	4.28	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.32	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.80
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.60
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	1	1	3	4.40	849/1546	4.40	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.40
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding							0	1	0	2	4.33	481/1323	4.33	3.76	4.00	4.10	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.28	4.10	4.32	4.67
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.47	4.29	4.55	4.50
		-	_	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.54	4.31	4.60	4.67
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.01	4.03	4.22	5.00
				Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i oı	n									
					1				-									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Тур	e			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduate	:	0	Majo	 r	5
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5						_			-								
56-83							neral	L				0	Under-gr	ad	8	Non-	major	3
84-150	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
	P 0												response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other							7						

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 785

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Spring 2008

Course-Section: ENGL 442 0101 University of Maryland Title VISUAL LITERACY Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

17

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.16	4.31	4.45	4.4
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1037/1666	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.35	4.2
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.37	4.3
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.16	4.07	4.17	4.3
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	733/1528	4.22	4.35	4.12	4.26	4.2
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	2	0	4	3.56	1445/1650	3.56	4.06	4.22	4.28	3.5
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1652/1667	3.44	4.50	4.67	4.73	3.4
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	900/1626	4.10	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.32	4.46	4.58	4.0
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.8
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1299/1549	3.78	4.33	4.31	4.43	3.7
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1240/1546	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	3.8
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1323	****	3.76	4.00	4.10	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	638/1384	4.30	4.28	4.10	4.32	4.3
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.55	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	281/1378	4.90	4.54	4.31	4.60	4.9
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 904	****	4.01	4.03	4.22	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.80	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.60	* * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.56	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.53	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.67	***

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

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

Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE Spring 2008

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1 Did vo	u dain n	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.16	4.31	4.45	4.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1666		4.21	4.27	4.35	5.00
		uestions reflect			0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406		4.42	4.32	4.48	5.00
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	210/1615		4.31	4.24	4.37	4.86
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1566		4.16	4.07	4.17	5.00
				o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1528		4.35	4.12	4.26	5.00
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	272/1650		4.06	4.22	4.28	4.75
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667		4.50	4.67	4.73	4.88
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1626			4.11	4.28	5.00
	1	J		J									,					
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures			2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559		4.32	4.46	4.58	4.67
		ctor seem intere			3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.80
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.75	3.76	4.00	4.10	4.75
		D !																
1 544 -1		Discuss			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	г оо	1 /1 2 0 4	г оо	4 20	1 10	4 20	г оо
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7 7	5.00	1/1384		4.28	4.10	4.32	5.00
				d to participate d open discussion	1	-				-	-	5.00	1/1378		4.47	4.29	4.55	5.00
		echniques succes		a open arscussion	1	0 1	0 1	0	0	0	7 5	5.00 4.33	1/1378 328/ 904		4.54 4.01	4.31	4.60 4.22	5.00 4.33
4. Weie s	рестат с	eciniques succes	SSLUI		Т	1	Τ	U	U	U	5	4.33	320/ 904	4.33	4.01	4.03	4.22	4.33
		Seminar	<u>.</u>															
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.83	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available f	or ind	ividual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.38	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribu	ite to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.50	4.57	4.56	5.00
4. Did pr	esentati	ons contribute t	o what	you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.00	4.45	4.53	5.00
5. Were c	riteria	for grading made	e clear		6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.33	3.97	3.67	5.00
	Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n												
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А 6		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	- – – –	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	8
28-55	0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1									,	-	-		-	-	5 ~		-
56-83						Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				3 -	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	-			E 0	Electives												_	

Other

6

Page 786

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 480 0101 University of Maryland Title

SEMINAR-ADV JOURNALISM Baltimore County Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS Spring 2008

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 11

Page 787 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	518/1670	4.64	1 16	4.31	4.45	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5		703/1666		4.10	4.31	4.45	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.75	318/1406		4.42	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	412/1615	4.64	4.31	4.24	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	181/1566		4.16	4.07	4.17	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	600/1528	4.36	4.35	4.12	4.26	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	6	1		1448/1650	3.55	4.06	4.12	4.28	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	8		1206/1667		4.50	4.67	4.73	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	255/1626			4.11	4.28	4.70
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		U	U	U	U	3	,	4.70	255/1020	4.70	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1062/1559	4.36	4.32	4.46	4.58	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	410/1549	4.73	4.33	4.31	4.43	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	557/1546	4.64	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	529/1323	4.27	3.76	4.00	4.10	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	278/1384	4.73	4.28	4.10	4.32	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	503/1378	4.64	4.47	4.29	4.55	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.54	4.31	4.60	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.01	4.03	4.22	4.00
Seminar					•	_	_				4 00		4 00	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 87	****	4.83	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.38	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 75	****	4.50	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.00	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.67	****

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0) Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad 11	l Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means th	nere are not enoug	jh
				Р	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	8	_	_	
				?	0					

University of Maryland Page 788
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 493 0101

2

SEMINAR IN CT

MAHER, JENNIFER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

					Frequencies Ins			tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect					
		Question				NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean			_			Mean
		 Genera																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	ills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.16	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	r the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.21	4.27	4.35	4.00
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.16	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1274/1528	3.50	4.35	4.12	4.26	3.50
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	ly expl	ained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.06	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.50
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene						0	0	1	0	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.28	4.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.28	4.10	4.32	4.50
				ed to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	4.47	4.29	4.55	3.50
		_	_	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.60	4.50
		Semina	ar															
1. Were a	assigned	topics relevant	t to th	e announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 87	4.50	4.83	4.65	4.80	4.50
	-	-		dividual attention	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	75/ 79	3.50	4.38	4.64	4.60	3.50
3. Did re	esearch p	rojects contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.50	4.57	4.56	4.00
	_	ons contribute		_	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	62/ 79	4.00	4.00	4.45	4.53	4.00
_		for grading mad		-	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	4.33	3.97	3.67	4.00
		Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	ı											
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade			Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Т	/pe			Majors	;
00 27	-										0	Cwad		·			1	
00-27 28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 1 B 1		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	U	Graduat	.e	0	Majo)r.	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	-	В 1	G							0	1		0	37		-

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Title GENRE ANALYSIS Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER Enrollment: 1

Course-Section: ENGL 649 0101

Questionnaires: 1

Page 789 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.16	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.21	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.16	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.35	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.06	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.32	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.40	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.51	5.00

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