University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 693 Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from	n this course	1	0	3	2	3	3	0	2.55	1565/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	2.55
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	1	0	3	2	2	4	0	2.64	1561/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	2.64
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	3	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1269/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.25
		ations reflect			1	1	2	1	4	2	1	2.90	1489/1520	4.08	4.32		4.09	2.90
	_	-		what you learned	1	2	2	2	3	2			1446/1465		4.16	4.12	4.02	2.56
				what you learned	1	0	2	1		3			1332/1434			4.14		
		g system clearly		ined	1	2	0	3	1	4			1396/1547	3.76		4.19	4.10	
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	6	5			1559/1574				4.59	
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	l teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	1	1	6	1	0	2.78	1504/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	2.78
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures	-	_	2	0	2	1	4	1			1452/1488			4.47		
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	1	4	3			1467/1493			4.73	4.65	3.60
				xplained clearly	2	0	3	0	4	1			1444/1486		4.30			2.90
		es contribute to			2	0	2	4	1	3			1466/1489		4.24			2.50
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	1	6	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1260/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	2.20
		Discuss																
				what you learned	5	0	2	0	3	2			1233/1279			4.17		
				d to participate	4	0	1	0	3	4			1181/1270		4.49	4.35	4.09	3.25
				d open discussion	4	0	2	0	3	2			1210/1269		4.48		4.09	
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		4	2	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	843/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	2.67
		Laborat	-															
5. Were r	requiremen	its for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
		Seminar	•															
5. Were c	criteria f	for grading made	e clear		1	0	0	0	10	0	1	3.18	259/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.18
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	5	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self I	aced															
5. Were t	there enou	igh proctors for	all th	ne students	5	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4								n	 Graduat		 1	Majo		0
00-27 28-55	4 1	1.00-0.99	0	A 4 B 4		кес	quir	eu I	or Ma	ijors	5 I	. 0	Graduat	C	т	Ma Jo	JΤ	U
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	B 4		Gor	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non	-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		Gel	rici d					J	onder-g	rau 1		14011-	ilia JOI	14
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	her					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101

Title COMPOSITION

Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 12

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County COMPOSITION Spring 2009

> Questions General

Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Page 694 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Ctudont	('011760	Evaluation	()1100+101	nnaire

Frequencies Instructor

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

		Genera w insights,ski tor make clear:	lls fro		0	0	0	1 1	2	5 5	8 10	4.25	952/1576 608/1576		4.12 4.22		4.11 4.18	4.25 4.50
		estions reflec			0	10	0	0	1	1			583/1342				4.19	4.50
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	2	2	5	7		1012/1520		4.32		4.09	4.06
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	818/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.06
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	6	6		806/1434					4.13
		system clearl		ined	0	0	1	1	3		10		955/1547					4.13
		was class canc		1.1	0 2	0 1	0	0	0	1	15		328/1574				4.59	
9. HOW WOL	uia you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	U	U	۷	10	Τ	3.92	1032/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.92
1 Wara th	he instru	Lectur actor's lecture		nrenared	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4 53	834/1488	<i>Δ</i> 1Ω	4.35	4 47	4 41	4.53
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0				390/1493		4.72			
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1				499/1486		4.30			
		s contribute t			1	0	0	0	2	2					4.24			
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	5	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	923/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.70
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2			774/1279		4.22		3.96	4.09
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3			447/1270				4.09	
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	8		479/1269		4.48		4.09	
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	sstul		5	3	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	179/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.63
F		Labora			2	0	•	0	•	1.0	0	4 00	000/ 250	4 01	2 05	4 00	4 15	4 00
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
E Wome as	witawia f	Seminal Seminal or grading made			4	0	0	0	12	0	0	2 00	287/ 375	2 04	2 25	4 01	2 70	2 00
5. Were Ci	riteria i	or grading mad	e Clear		4	U	U	U	12	U	U	3.00	201/ 3/3	3.04	3.43	4.01	3.70	3.00
E Did gor	nforongos	Field '		ield activities	3	0	0	0	13	0	0	2 00	251/ 326	2 06	2 07	1 02	2 61	3 00
5. Dia coi	literences	neip you carr	y Out I	ieiu accivicies	3	U	U	U	13	U	U	3.00	231/ 320	3.00	3.07	4.03	3.04	3.00
5. Were th	here enou	Self :		he students	4	0	0	0	12	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00
3. 11010 01		SIL PLOCOCIS 10	_							Ü	ŭ	3.00	313, 302	3.07	3.22	1.00	3.00	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Тур	e			Majors	\$
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduate	:	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5				_						_	_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 5		Gei	nera:	Τ				0	Under-gr	ad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150 Grad.	1 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	3 4	D 0 F 0		. וים	ecti	7707				0	#### - M	leana +	hero o	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	7	P 0		E-T (ECLI.	ves				U	response					111
				I O		Otl	her					4	_ CSPOIDC					
				? 0														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301

25

COMPOSITION

TERHORST, RAYMO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Page 695 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	20116	ncie	g		Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	916/1576		4.12	4.30	4.11	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	462/1576		4.22	4.27	4.18	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	11	4.40		4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43			4.16	4.12	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52			4.31	4.14	3.94	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	4.24		3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	7		1262/1574		4.43	4.64	4.59	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	229/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	211/1486		4.30	4.32	4.26	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	500/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	2	8	4.64			3.63	4.03	3.91	
o, bia addivibual commiques emanec four andersounding	Ü	-	Ü	ŭ	_	_	Ü	1.01	200, 12	3.33	3.03	1.05	3.71	1.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	365/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	541/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	567/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	164/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	14	0		296/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	3.93
o, more requirements for tab reports creating specifical	Ü	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	_		ŭ	3.75	250, 375	1.01	3.03	1.20	1113	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	14	1	0	3.07	284/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.07
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	13	0	1	3.14		3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.14
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	-		-	-			- ,					_
Self Paced			•	_										
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, -	****	4.38	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301 Title COMPOSITION Instructor:

TERHORST, RAYMO

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 21 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 695 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2009

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 13

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

1

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0601

Page 696 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne		s from this course	0	0	1	2	6	3	1	3.08	1531/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.08
			he expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	3	2		1488/1576			4.27	4.18	3.23
			the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	2	3		1076/1342			4.32	4.19	3.89
			he expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1352/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.54
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribut	e to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1138/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.70
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contrib	ute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	844/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.08
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explained	1	0	3	4	2	1	2	2.58	1512/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	2.58
8. How mar	ny times	was class cancel	led	2	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1427/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.09
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overall	teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	6	2	0	2.90	1485/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	2.90
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures		1	0	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1448/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.08
			ted in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1355/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.25
			and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	1		3.50	1330/1486	4.13	4.30		4.26	
		es contribute to		1	0	1	2	4	1			1341/1489		4.24		4.22	
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enha	nce your understanding	1	7	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	585/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.20
		Discussi															
			e to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3		981/1279		4.22	4.17	3.96	3.71
			uraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	0	3		1151/1270		4.49	4.35	4.09	3.43
		_	ir and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	2			1005/1269			4.35	4.09	
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques success	tul	6	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.50
F 17		Laborato	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	4 00	222/25	. 4 01	2 05	4 00	4 1 5	4 00
5. were re	equiremen	its for lab repor	ts clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	8	U	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
_		Seminar	-	_													
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made	clear	3	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
1 1	-	Field Wo		_	•							0=4 / 004			4 00		
5. Did cor	nierences	s help you carry	out field activities	5	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00
		Self Pa	ced														
5. Were th	nere enou	igh proctors for	all the students	5	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00
		Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 3	0.00-0.99	 0 A 6								 6	 Graduat		0	 Ma∹a		0
28-55	3 1		0 A 6 0 B 3		ĸe	quir	eu I	OT M	ajors	>	U	Graduat	. ᠸ	U	Majo)T	U
56-83	0		2 C 1		Co	nera	1				0	Under-	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		36	c. a	-				J	onact -g	,144	- 3	14011		13
51 150	-	3.00 3.19	2 0								•						

Electives

Other

0

3

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Page 697 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

							FT	eque	encie	S		ıns	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did you	u dain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	4	2	5	4	1	2 75	1558/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	2.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	6	5			1511/1576				4.18	3.13
		uestions reflec			0	3	0	1	6	4	2		1201/1342					3.54
		uations reflect			0	1	1	3	0	8			1330/1520				4.09	3.60
				what you learned	0	3	1	3	5	1	3		1358/146				4.02	3.15
	_	_		what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	3			1227/143			4.14		3.47
		g system clearl			0	0	4	3	3	4	2		1495/154			4.19	4.10	
	_	was class cand		inea	0	0	0	0	2	14	_		1526/157					3.88
	-			ning effectiveness	6	0	2	1	5	2			1511/155					
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	3	2	7	1	1	2.64	1474/1488	3 4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	2.64
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	1	3	6			1435/1493				4.65	3.93
				xplained clearly	2	0	3	1	5	3			1421/1486		4.30			
		es contribute t			2	0	3	2	2	3			1389/1489		4.24			
				our understanding	2	9	1	2	1	1			1248/127					
). Did auc	ulovisua	i tecimiques en	mance yo	our understanding	۷	9	1	۷		1	U	2.40	1240/12/	3.55	3.03	4.03	3.91	2.40
ו הלה ו		Discus		-b 1	_	0	2	1	_	1	1	2 64	1020/107	. 275	4 22	1 17	2 06	2 6
				what you learned	5	0	3 0	1	5 5	1			1238/1279				3.96	2.64
				d to participate	5	0	-			-	3		1178/1270				4.09	3.27
				d open discussion	5	0	0	1	5	2			1076/1269				4.09	
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	sstul		5	2	2	4	2	0	1	2.33	858/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	2.33
		Labora	_		•	•	•	•		•			000/05			4 00	4 4 =	
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	9 4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
		Semina			_		•	•					005/05			4 04		
5. Were cr	riteria	for grading mad	e clear		5	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	287/ 37!	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
		Field																
5. Did cor	nference	s help you carr	y out fi	ield activities	7	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00
E Wome th	hawa ana	Self ugh proctors fo		oo atudonta	6	0	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	2 07	າ າາ	1 00	2 06	2 00
o. were ti	nere eno	ugii proctors to	ı alı tı	le students	b	U	U	U	10	U	U	3.00	313/ 30.	2 3.07	3.44	4.00	3.00	3.00
				Frequ	lency	7 Dis	strib	utio	on									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	eason	s			Ty	/pe			Majors	5
00-27						Re	 equir	ed f	or M	ajors	 s	9	Graduat	 :e	0	 Мајс	 or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ge	enera	1				0	Under-	grad	16	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0										•			3	
						F:1	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means	there :	are not	enouc	rh
			<u> </u>		11		* ~ ~				9	пипп				_		
Grad.	U			P 0									regnone	ses to	he siar	nificar	n†	
	U	P I				O+	her					2	respons	ses to :	be sigr	nificar	nt	
	0		0 0			enera Lecti							Means	there a	are not	t enoi		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701

Title COMPOSITION

Instructor: DIALLO, MAMADOU

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16 Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Enrollment: 21 Ouestionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 698

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 8 5 5 3.68 1374/1576 3.76 4.12 4.30 4.11 3.68 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 3 5 9 4.05 1107/1576 4.01 4.22 4.27 4.18 4.05 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 835/1342 4.20 4.32 4.32 4.19 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 3 7 8 4.28 837/1520 4.08 4.32 4.25 4.09 4.28 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 4 6 7 3.89 996/1465 3.73 4.16 4.12 4.02 3.89 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 3 7 8 4.28 659/1434 4.14 4.31 4.14 3.94 4.287. Was the grading system clearly explained
9. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 3 5 10 4.26 827/1547 3.76 4.07 4.19 4.10 4.26 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 17 4.84 586/1574 4.30 4.43 4.64 4.59 4.84 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2 11 3 4.06 892/1554 3.75 4.08 4.10 4.01 4.06 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 0 2 15 4.72 568/1488 4.18 4.35 4.47 4.41 4.72 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 17 4.84 708/1493 4.61 4.72 4.73 4.65 4.84 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 6 11 4.47 720/1486 4.13 4.30 4.32 4.26 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 7 10 4.26 948/1489 4.03 4.24 4.32 4.22 4.26 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 3 0 5 0 2 2.80 1203/1277 3.55 3.63 4.03 3.91 2.80 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 6 6 3.94 860/1279 3.75 4.22 4.17 3.96 3.94 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 1 1 4 11 4.47 666/1270 4.22 4.49 4.35 4.09 4.47 0 2 1 13 4.47 669/1269 4.24 4.48 4.35 4.09 4.47 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 1 3 5 7 4.13 435/878 3.73 4.02 4.05 3.91 4.13 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 240 **** 3.20 4.35 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 1 0 0 0 12 0 4.00 229/379 4.01 3.85 4.20 4.15 4.00 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.58 4.72 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.69 4.52 **** 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.13 4.64 4.43 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 4.43 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 0 0 0 12 0 2 3.29 240/375 3.04 3.25 4.01 3.78 3.29 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.50 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 18 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 **** 3.50 4.73 4.71 **** 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 45 **** 3.75 4.57 4.72 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 9 1 0 3.10 247/ 326 3.06 3.07 4.03 3.64 3.10 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.38 4.60 4.44 **** 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.25 4.67 4.68 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 0 0

7 1 0

0 10 0 1 3.18 286/382 3.07 3.22 4.08 3.86 3.18

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901 Title COMPOSITION Instructor:

BLOOM, RYAN I.

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 698 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits H	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 699 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	encie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sec Mea
511	General	5	0	•	•	0	2	-		2 44	1480/1586	2 56	4 10	4 20	4 11	2 4
	new insights, skill		0	0	2	2	3	5 5			1470/1576			4.30	4.11	
	ructor make clear t		0	0	1	1	5		4		1360/1576		4.22	4.27	4.18	3.6
	questions reflect		0	1	1 1	3	4	5			1267/1342			4.32	4.19	3.2
	raluations reflect t		0	0		2	3	6			1320/1520			4.25	4.09	3.0
		te to what you learned	1	0	3	0	7	5			1407/1465			4.12	4.02	
		oute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	2			1263/1434			4.14		3.
_	ling system clearly	-	1	•	-	3	2	_			1422/1547			4.19	4.10	
	nes was class cancel		1	0	0	0	1	6			1128/1574		4.43	4.64		
. How would yo	ou grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	4	4	3	Τ	2.79	1503/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	2.
	Lecture		-	0	4	0	4	_	4	2 00	1242/1400	4 10	4 25	4 45	4 41	2 /
	tructor's lectures	± ±	1	0	1	0	4	6			1343/1488			4.47		
	ructor seem interes	_	1	0	0	0	1	4	10		1125/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.
		and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	5			1233/1486		4.30		4.26	
	ures contribute to	-	1	0	2	2	4	5			1392/1489			4.32	4.22	
. Did audiovis	sual techniques enha	ance your understanding	1	2	2	1	4	5	1	3.15	1131/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.
	Discussi															
		te to what you learned	6	0	2	2	4	0	2		1224/1279		4.22	4.17	3.96	2.
		ouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	4		928/1270		4.49	4.35	4.09	4.
	_	air and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	1			1018/1269		4.48	4.35		3.
. Were special	techniques success	sful	6	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	694/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.
	Laborato	-														
		e background information		0	1	0	0	0			****/ 240		3.20	4.35	4.29	**:
. Were require	ments for lab repor	rts clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.0
	Seminar	_	_													
. Were criter:	a for grading made	clear	7	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.0
Did sestance	Field Wo		4	0	٥	0	11	0	1	2 17	222/ 226	2.06	2 07	4 02	2 64	.
. Did conferen	ices neip you carry	out field activities	4	0	0	0	11	0	Τ	3.1/	232/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.1
Word there	Self Pa enough proctors for		9	0	0	0	7	0	0	2 00	313/ 382	2 07	2 22	1 00	2 06	2 (
. Were there e	mough proceds for						•	U	U	3.00	313/ 302	3.07	3.22	4.00	3.00	3.0
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utic	on									
redits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	eason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 3	0.00-0.99	0 A 11		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	7	Graduat	.e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55 2	1.00-1.99	0 B 2														
56-83 1	2.00-2.99	3 C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	1
84-150 1	3.00-3.49	5 D 0														
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00	0 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	gh
		P 0									respons	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
		I 0			her											

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401

21

COMPOSITION

WALTERS, APRIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Page 700 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 1	2 0 1 1 1	0 1 2 1 0	4 0 2 1 6	2 6 3 2 3	5 6 4 7 3 8	4.31 3.58 4.08 3.50	1405/1576 891/1576 1189/1342 1008/1520 1242/1465 544/1434	3.76 4.01 4.20 4.08 3.73 4.14	4.12 4.22 4.32 4.32 4.16 4.31	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14	4.11 4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94	3.62 4.31 3.58 4.08 3.50 4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 3	0 0 0	1 0 0	0 0	2 0 3	6 9 5	4	3.92 4.31	1124/1547 1288/1574 1060/1554	3.76 4.30 3.75	4.07 4.43 4.08	4.19 4.64 4.10	4.10 4.59 4.01	3.92 4.31
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 2 0	1 0 1 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 3 2 1	3 2 2 4 5	7 9 5 3 3	4.82 3.91 4.11	1025/1488 784/1493 1197/1486 1057/1489 958/1277	4.18 4.61 4.13 4.03 3.55	4.35 4.72 4.30 4.24 3.63	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91	4.82 3.91 4.11
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	4 4 4	0 0 0 2	2 1 0 1	0 1 0 0	2 1 2 1	1 1 3 2	5 4		1043/1279 1011/1270 835/1269 580/ 878	3.75 4.22 4.24 3.73	4.22 4.49 4.48 4.02	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	3.96 4.09 4.09 3.91	3.56 3.89 4.22 3.86
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar	3	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	208/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.10
5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work	4	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced	6	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency	_	0 Dist	0 trib	Ü	5 n	0	U	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0			quir		or Ma	jors		7 0	Graduate Under-g		0	Majo Non-	major	0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 1			ecti her	ves				1	#### - I respons				_	h

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

Title

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501

COMPOSITION

Self Paced

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

I	age	701
JUL	2,	2009
Job	IRBE	R3029

			Fre	-	ncie				tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	4 00	1148/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	502/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	541/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	418/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	5	6		1102/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	704/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	0	12	4.29	794/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5		1295/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	7	4		1074/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	957/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	908/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	911/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	777/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	856/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	957/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	5		4.00	928/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	5	4	3		1082/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	782/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.18
- 1 ·														
Laboratory	1.0	^	0	0	1	0	^	2 00	****/ O24		2 02	4 00	4 00	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16 16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 240 ****/ 229	****	4.00	4.35 4.51	4.29	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	200/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.29	4.15	4.13
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	9	U	U	U	U	,	1	4.13	200/ 3/9	4.01	3.05	4.20	4.15	4.13
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
	-	Ü	3	Ü		ŭ	ŭ	2,00		01				2.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00

Frequency Distribution

11 0 0 0 5 0 1 3.33 250/382 3.07 3.22 4.08 3.86 3.33

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601

24

COMPOSITION

PUTZEL, DIANE M

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Page 702 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Genera insights,ski or make clear	lls from		0	0	1 0	1 2	3 3	10 6	5 9		1283/1576 1076/1576		4.12 4.22	4.30	4.11 4.18	3.85
3. Did the	exam que	estions reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	14 1	0	0	0	2	4 8	4.67 4.11	406/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.67 4.11
			_	what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	11		3.95	919/1465		4.16	4.12	4.02	3.95
				what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	7	11	4.25	682/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.25
		system clearly		ined	0	1	0	3	2	6		4.00	1041/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.00
	-	as class cance			0	0	0	0	0 3	8 7	12 8		1003/1574		4.43	4.64	4.59	4.60
9. HOW WOU	ia you gr			ning effectiveness	2	U	U	U	3	/	8	4.28	692/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.28
1 Were th	e instruc	Lecture tor's lecture:		repared	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	624/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.70
		or seem inter	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	683/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.85
				cplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	763/1486	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.45
	the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	997/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.20
5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					3	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	600/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.18
1. Did cla	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learne						2	0	2	5	10	4.11	771/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.11
				d to participate	1 1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	532/1270		4.49	4.35	4.09	4.63
3. Did the	instruct	or encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	467/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.74
4. Were sp	ecial tec	chniques succes	ssful		1	6	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	451/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.08
		Labora	torv															
2. Were yo	u provide		-	ground information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	***
5. Were re	quirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	7	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	iteria fo	or grading made	e clear		12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
5. Did con	ferences	Field Whelp you carry		ield activities	10	0	0	0	9	0	1	3.20	223/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.20
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were the	ere enoug	gh proctors for	r all th	ne students	12	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	269/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.25
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	ason	s 			Туј	ре 			Majors	3
00-27							quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	4	Graduate	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 0						neral	_				0	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	20
84-150 Grad.	150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						ectiv	700				0	#### - I	Means +	hero o	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	Ŧ	P 0		Е⊥€	=C L 1 \	CS				U	response				_	111
		3 0 I 0		Oth	ner					5	-		3					

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1801 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County PEKARSKE, NICOL

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Page 703 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
Quebelonb														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1094/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1082/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	614/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	1225/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	398/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	971/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	3	3	2	2		1566/1574		4.43	4.64	4.59	3.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	924/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	,	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1489	4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	0	-		****/1277		3.63	4.03	3.91	****
• • •														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	****
T - 1														
Laboratory	2	0	0	^	0	0	_	4 00	000/ 270	4 01	2 05	4 00	4 1 5	4 00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
The second secon									,					
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	****
1 die die die die die de die de	_	ŭ	Ü	Ū	_	Ū	ŭ	3.00	, 302	3.07	3.22	1.00	3.00	
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 704 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Ouestionnaires: 20
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901

2

0

84-150

Grad.

3

3

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

COMPOSITION

FLANIGAN, SEAN

Title

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 20	Student Co	urse	Eval	uati	lon Q	uesti	onn	aire							
					_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sec
	Questions	NR 	NA	1	2 	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea:
	General														
l. Did you gain new	insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	568/1576	3.76	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.5
. Did the instructo	or make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	476/1576	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.6
. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	443/1342	4.20	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.6
. Did other evaluat	ions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	511/1520	4.08	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.
. Did assigned read	lings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	596/1465	3.73	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.
	nments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	323/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.
	system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	5	7	3.70	1259/1547	3.76	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.
. How many times wa		0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	4.30	4.43	4.64	4.59	5.
. How would you gra	de the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	477/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.
	Lecture														
	or's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0				173/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47		
	or seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	810/1493	4.61	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.
	rial presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69		4.13	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.
	contribute to what you learned	5 6	0	0	0 1	0 4	4	11			4.03	4.24	4.32	4.22	
. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance your understanding	О	U	U	1	4	3	6	4.00	692/1277	3.55	3.63	4.03	3.91	4.
Did alage disayes	Discussion sions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	962/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.
	s actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67		4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.
	or encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	535/1269	4.24	4.48	4.35	4.09	4
Were special tech	-	8	2	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.73		4.05	3.91	
	Laboratory														
. Were you provided	l with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	* *
. Were necessary ma	terials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	* *
	ructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.27	* *
. Were requirements	s for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.
	Seminar									005/055	2 24		4 0 7		
. Were criteria for	grading made clear	12	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.
Did field evperie	Field Work ence contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	* *
_	inderstand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	* *
	or available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	* *
	ould you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	* *
_	melp you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13		3.06	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.
	Self Paced														
. Were there enough	proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	* *
	Freq	uency	y Dis	trib	outio	n									
redits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27 11	0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Re	 quir	red f	 or Ma	 jor	s 1	4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
28-55 3	1.00-1.99 0 B 12									TT 3		0			_
56-83 1	2.00-2.99 6 C 3		Ge	nera	ŧΤ				0	Under-g	raa 2	0	Non-	-major	1

Electives

Other

1

5

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

? 1

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 705 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Questions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean			Mean	Mean
General									004/4556			4 00		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0			4.75	301/1576	3.76		4.30		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63		4.01	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1		4.75	298/1342	4.20		4.32		4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0			4.93	96/1520	4.08		4.25		4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5			251/1465	3.73			4.02	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2			193/1434		4.31		3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4			774/1547			4.19		4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7			1033/1574				4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	3.75	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	736/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	10		1017/1493			4.73	4.65	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3			678/1486	4.13			4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2			696/1489				4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	4			791/1277					
	_	_	-	_	_	_	_		,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2		4.33		3.75	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	4.22	4.49	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269				4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	400/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.20
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.01	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
									,					
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.04	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	2 06	2 07	4 02	2 61	2 00
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	9	U	U	U	/	U	U	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.07	4.03	3.04	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.07	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00
P		- -	1		_									
Frequ	iency	DIS	LTID	ıcıoı	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Per	quire			aior		9	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		0
28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 5		1000	1411	-u 10	J. 1116	۱۰۲ م	5	_	Graduati	_	J	1.101		O
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 3		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad 1	6	Non-	major	16
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 4 D 0								-	9-		-		5	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
P 0									response					
I 0		Otł	ner					4		~			-	
? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001 Title COMPOSITION

Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16 JUL 2, 2009

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101 University of Maryland COMPOSITION Baltimore County Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR Spring 2009

Title

Page 706 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncie	c c		Tne	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	2	5	7	3		1392/1576		4.12	4.30	4.11	3.65
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	2	9	3		1330/1576		4.22	4.27	4.18	3.71
	_	estions reflec			0	4	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	972/1342			4.32	4.19	4.00
		uations reflect			0	1	0	1	2	11	2		1185/1520		4.32	4.25	4.09	3.88
	_	-		hat you learned	0	0	2	1	3	6	5		1180/1465		4.16	4.12	4.02	3.65
				what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	7		857/1434		4.31	4.14	3.94	4.06
		g system clearl		ned	1	0	1	2	4	5	4		1320/1547		4.07	4.19	4.10	3.5
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	1	4	12		942/1574		4.43	4.64	4.59	4.65
9. How wo	ould you s	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	6	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.50
		Lectur	e															
l. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	1103/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.27
	lecture material presented and explained cl the lectures contribute to what you learned			2	0	0	0	1	5	9		1184/1493		4.72	4.73	4.65	4.5	
			_	2	0	0	1	5	5	4		1233/1486			4.32	4.26	3.8	
					2	0	0	2	3	4			1169/1489		4.24		4.22	
					2	7	1	0	4	1			1074/1277				3.91	
. 214 44	audiovisual techniques enhance your understa				_	•	_	ŭ	-	_	_	3.30	10,1,12,,	3.37	3.03	1.05	3.71	3.3
							_											
					6	0	1	2	2	2			1047/1279			4.17	3.96	3.5
		-	_	to participate	6	0	0	0	2	5		4.18	860/1270		4.49	4.35	4.09	4.1
				open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	4		4.09	909/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.0
l. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		6	3	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	747/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.3
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	nding of	the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	***
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backg	round information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	***
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable fo	r lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	***
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad			16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	***
		0.15	. .															
5. Were t	here enoi	Self ugh proctors fo		e students	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	***
						_	-	-	_	_	_		,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
 00-27	s Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr					Red		ed f	 or M	aior	 -s 1	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		100	24TT	-u -	J. 1º1	⊥∪ر م	. ~ 1		Siddudt	_	5	1100		3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C 4		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		061	ıcıa	_				J	onaci -g	144 1	. ,	14011		± /
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		ਸ ੀ 2	ecti	WAG.				0	#### -	Meang +	here s	re not	enous	rh
SI aa.	J	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		15.1.6		v C D				5	respons				_	1++
				I O		O+1	ner					3	respons	בם נט ג	e sign	ııııcaı	10	
				5 U		ULI	161					3						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201 COMPOSITION Baltimore County DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Spring 2009

Page 707

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24				
Questionnaires:	18	Student Cou	urse 1	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 1 1 1 0 0 1	0 0 10 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	1 0 0 1 0 0 1 0	2 0 0 0 1 1 3 1	3 4 0 4 2 2 2 2 11	11 13 7 12 15 14 11 6	4.41 4.76 5.00 4.59 4.78 4.56 4.35 4.28 4.88	360/1434 737/1547 1309/1574	3.79 4.16 4.11 4.12 3.89 4.06 3.97 4.51 3.90	4.12 4.22 4.32 4.32 4.16 4.31 4.07 4.43 4.08	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64 4.10	4.11 4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94 4.10 4.59 4.01	4.41 4.76 5.00 4.59 4.78 4.56 4.35 4.28 4.88
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3 3 3 3	0 0 0 0 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	3 0 5 2 3	12 15 10 13 6	4.80 5.00 4.67 4.87 4.00	401/1488 1/1493 468/1486 240/1489 692/1277	4.24 4.62 4.22 4.05 3.37	4.35 4.72 4.30 4.24 3.63	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91	4.80 5.00 4.67 4.87 4.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	3 3 3 3	0 0 0 2	0 0 0 1	0 0 0	1 0 0 4	1 1 1 2	13 14 14 6	4.80 4.93 4.93 3.92	194/1269	3.94 4.23 4.29 3.77	4.22 4.49 4.48 4.02	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	3.96 4.09 4.09 3.91	4.80 4.93 4.93 3.92
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	***
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	***
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	***
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 5 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8			_		or Ma	jor			Graduat		0	Majo		0
56-83			neral ectiv	_				0 0 3	Under-g: #### - 1 respons	Means t		re not	_	18 h

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 708 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 															
1. Did vo	ou gain new	insights,skil		this course	0	0	1	1	1	9	4	3.88	1266/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.88
		or make clear			0	0	1	0	5	4	6		1253/1576		4.22	4.27	4.18	3.88
		stions reflect			0	2	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	812/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.29
4. Did ot	ther evalua	tions reflect	the exped	cted goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1041/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did as	ssigned rea	dings contribu	ite to wha	at you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	850/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did w	ritten assi	gnments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	682/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.25
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	z explaine	ed	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	838/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.25
8. How ma	any times w	as class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1227/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.67
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	1	0	5			870/1488		4.35	4.47	4.41	4.50
		or seem intere		-	0	0	0	0	1	6	9		1210/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.50
		lained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	8		821/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.40		
	ne lectures		1	0	0	1	2	2			813/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22			
5. Did au	udiovisual	r understanding	1	7	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1107/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.25		
		Discuss																
				at you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4		4.14	-,		4.22	4.17	3.96	4.14
		-	_	to participate	2	0	1	0	3	3			910/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.07
				open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	3		4.36	,	4.29	4.48	4.35		4.36
4. Were s	special tec	chniques succes	sstul		2	7	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.14
_		Laborat	_							_								
5. Were 1	requirement	s for lab repo	orts clear	rly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	****
		Semina																
5. Were	criteria fo	or grading made	e clear		14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****
		Field W	Vork															
5. Did co	onferences	help you carry	out fie	ld activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	***
		Self I																
5. Were t	there enoug	h proctors for	all the	students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	***
				Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utior	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27								 ed fa	or Ma	ior	 a 1		Graduat	 a	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	А 3 В 8		ve.	JUTT (cu I	or ma	اتار	U I	. •	Graduati	_	U	ria JC	/_	J
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 3		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	C_ U.	-				-	onacı 'g.		. •	14011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - I	Means +	here a	are not	enoug	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	_	P 0								_	response					,
				I O		Oth	her					5					-	
				? 0								-						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 709 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	2		1333/1576		4.12	4.30	4.11	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5		1040/1576		4.22	4.27	4.18	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	4		1089/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	4		1241/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	3	4.00	850/1465	3.89		4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3 6	8	3	4.00	878/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1 1	1	4 5	3 7		1285/1547 1302/1574	3.97 4.51	4.07 4.43	4.19 4.64	4.10 4.59	3.64 4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	0	5 5	3		1132/1554		4.43	4.10	4.01	3.80
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	_	1		U	3	3	3.00	1132/1334	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.01	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1142/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	7		1337/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33		4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	5		1080/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	899/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	636/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	852/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	190/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	230/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	3.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	1	1	1		206/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	373/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	3.00
Seminar	1.0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2 50	02/ 05	2 50	4 50	4 70	4 50	2 50
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10 10	0	0	1 1	1 0	1 1	1 2	3.50 4.00	83/ 85 67/ 79	3.50 4.00	4.58 4.67	4.72 4.69	4.52 4.52	3.50 4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	1	1		72/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	77/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	3.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	223/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.40
or here errorra for grading made erear		Ü	ŭ	_	_	_	_	3.10	223, 3,3	3.21	3.23	1.01	3.70	3.10
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	40/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	42/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	43/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	3.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	2	1	1		43/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	3.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	35/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	3.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	24/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	3.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	33/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	3.50
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	28/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	3.75
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	219/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.50

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 709 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601

22

COMPOSITION

KILLGALLON, DON

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Page 710 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions					NA		eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean
		General															
		ew insights,skills f		0	0	2	3	1	7	4		1456/1576				4.11	
		ctor make clear the	_	0	0	1	1	2	4	9		1067/1576		4.22	4.27	4.18	4.12
	_	estions reflect the	_	0	6	1	1	3	3			1199/1342		4.32		4.19	3.55
		ations reflect the	_	0	0	1	1	1	8			1041/1520		4.32			4.00
	_	eadings contribute to	_	0	0	3	3	4	4			1377/1465		4.16		4.02	3.06
		signments contribute		0	0	3	1	3	6			1257/1434				3.94	
		g system clearly exp	lained	0	1	3	0	2	4	7		1239/1547				4.10	3.75
	-	was class cancelled		0 2	0 1	0 4	0	0 1	13 6			1339/1574		4.43			4.24
9. HOW WO	oura you g	grade the overall te	aching effectiveness	2	1	4	U	1	ь	3	3.29	1381/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.29
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	3	1	5	7	4.00	1233/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	1029/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.69
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	2	9	4.06	1081/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.06
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to wha	you learned	1	0	2	1	3	2	8	3.81	1231/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.81
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	1	2	2	6	1	4	3.20	1119/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.20
		Discussion															
1 Did al	ass discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	4	0	2	0	4	3	4	3 54	1051/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.54
		its actively encourage	-	4	0	1	0	2	5	5		928/1270		4.49	4.35	4.09	4.00
		ctor encourage fair		4	0	2	0	1	5			1007/1269		4.48		4.09	3.85
		echniques successful	and open disoussion	4	3	1	0	1	4		4.00			4.02		3.91	
		T alamah ama															
5. Were r	equiremen	Laboratory nts for lab reports	clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	****
3	0401101101	iob ioi ida iopoiob	Jedelly Specifica		ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ū	1.00	, 3.3	3	3.05	1120	1.15	
		Seminar						_		•					4 0 4		
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made clea	ar	14	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	****
		Self Paced															
3 Were v	our conta	acts with the instru	stor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****
-		ck/tutoring by proct	-	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 28			4.78	4.65	****
		igh proctors for all		13	1	0	0	3	0	0		****/ 382			4.08		***
		-	_			,											
			Frequ	ıency	, DIS	trib	ut10	n									
Credits E		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 13		Re		ed f	or M	aior	 s 1	1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		110	2~++	I	J. 11		- 1	_	2244440	-	,		-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	_J h
									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt				
	I 0		Ot	her					6								

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

TAYLOR, PAUL Instructor: Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 17

Page 711 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Eval	uation	Questio	onnaire
---------	--------	------	--------	---------	---------

				Fre	eanei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC.	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
	General														
1	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	8	2	4	3.29	1500/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.29
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	7		1107/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.06
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	931/1342		4.32	4.32	4.19	4.12
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19		4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.19
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	4		1051/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.82
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94			4.31	4.14	3.94	3.94
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	4	7		1235/1547		4.07	4.19	4.10	3.76
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3			625/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.82
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	6			1019/1554			4.10	4.01	
,	now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	O	_	U	J	O	5	3.73	1017/1331	3.70	1.00	1.10	1.01	3.73
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	7	4	3 53	1385/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	3.53
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	5	10		1311/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.35
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	7	5		1168/1486		4.30	4.32	4.26	3.94
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	4	5		1301/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.59
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	5	3	-		1043/1277		3.63	4.03	3.91	
5	Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	Τ	U	5	3	2	3.43	1043/12//	3.37	3.03	4.03	3.91	3.45
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	981/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.71
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21		4.23	4.49	4.17	4.09	4.21
			0	0	1	2		7		,					
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	1	0	1	4	4 5		4.21	,	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.21
4.	Were special techniques successful	3	Τ	U	Τ	4	5	3	3.77	625/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.//
	Laboratory														
1	Laboratory	1 -	-1	0	^	^	0	1	F 00	**** / 024	2 02	2 02	4 00	4 00	
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15 10	0	0	1	0	0 7	1		****/ 232		3.50	4.29	4.27	
5	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	U	U	U	U	7	U	4.00	229/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
	Q-miles														
-	Seminar	1 -	0	-	_	_	-	0	0 50	05	2 50	4 50	4 50	4 50	****
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.24	3.25	4.01	3.78	****
_	Field Work			_	_										
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	242/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.13
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****
5	Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 711 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 712 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	727/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	542/1576		4.22	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	406/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	511/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	304/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	524/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	784/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	2		1424/1574		4.43	4.64	4.59	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	449/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	624/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	557/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1		13	4.63	514/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 0	0 7	0	0 1	3	6 4	10 2	4.37	856/1489 1144/1277	4.05 3.37	4.24	4.32	4.22 3.91	4.37
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	,	3		3	-	2	3.00	1144/12//	3.37	3.03	4.03	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	783/1279		4.22	4.17	3.96	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	589/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	4	0	3	3	3.08	795/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.08
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234		3.83	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	14	1	4.07	216/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 72 ****/ 80	3.00 3.75	4.13	4.64	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19 13	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	****/ 80 240/ 375		4.43 3.25	4.61 4.01	4.55 3.78	3.29
5. Were criteria for grauting made crear	13	U	U	U	O	U	_	3.49	240/ 3/3	3.24	3.23	4.01	3.70	3.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45		3.75	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	177/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.57
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 712 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901 University of Maryland Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 713

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 2 5 5 2 3.19 1512/1576 3.79 4.12 4.30 4.11 3.19 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 1 3 5 5 3.63 1360/1576 4.16 4.22 4.27 4.18 3.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 1 0 3 2 2 3.50 1209/1342 4.11 4.32 4.32 4.19 3.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 2 0 4 3 6 3.73 1266/1520 4.12 4.32 4.25 4.09 3.73 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 3 6 2 3.20 1347/1465 3.89 4.16 4.12 4.02 3.20 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 0 5 4 4 3.53 1194/1434 4.06 4.31 4.14 3.94 3.537. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 1 1 1 4 3 4 3.62 1298/1547 3.97 4.07 4.19 4.10 3.62 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 7 7 4.50 1079/1574 4.51 4.43 4.64 4.59 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 2 1 0 5 2 1 3.22 1399/1554 3.90 4.08 4.10 4.01 3.22 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 2 3 5 5 3.69 1365/1488 4.24 4.35 4.47 4.41 3.69 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 9 4.38 1301/1493 4.62 4.72 4.73 4.65 4.38 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 0 4 5 5 3.69 1279/1486 4.22 4.30 4.32 4.26 3.69 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 5 6 2 3.25 1381/1489 4.05 4.24 4.32 4.22 3.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 2 4 5 2 2 2.87 1197/1277 3.37 3.63 4.03 3.91 2.87 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 3 1 3 3.30 1139/1279 3.94 4.22 4.17 3.96 3.30 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 1 2 4 3.50 1135/1270 4.23 4.49 4.35 4.09 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 1 1 3 0 5 3.70 1055/1269 4.29 4.48 4.35 4.09 3.70 4. Were special techniques successful 6 4 0 1 3 2 4.17 415/878 3.77 4.02 4.05 3.91 4.17 Laboratory 0 1 2 0 3.67 ****/ 234 3.83 3.83 4.23 4.08 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 13 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 240 3.20 3.20 4.35 4.29 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 229 4.00 4.00 4.51 4.43 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 14 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 232 3.50 3.50 4.29 4.27 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 00 1 10 0 3.91 325/ 379 3.77 3.85 4.20 4.15 3.91 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 3.50 4.58 4.72 4.52 **** 0 3.00 ****/ 79 4.00 4.67 4.69 4.52 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 1 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 3.00 ****/ 72 3.00 4.13 4.64 4.43 **** 0 0 1 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 3.75 4.43 4.61 4.55 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 8 1 0 3.11 279/375 3.24 3.25 4.01 3.78 3.11 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 4.00 4.00 4.48 4.20 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 3.50 3.50 4.40 4.11 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 3.50 3.50 4.73 4.71 **** 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 3.75 3.75 4.57 4.72 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9 0 0 0 7 0 0 3.00 251/326 3.19 3.07 4.03 3.64 3.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned $$ 15 $$ 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 40 3.75 4.38 4.60 4.44 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 15 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 3.50 4.25 4.83 4.71 **** 0 1 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 35 3.50 4.25 4.67 4.68 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 3.75 4.38 4.78 4.65 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students
11 0 0 0 5 0 0 3.00 313/ 382 3.19 3.22 4.08 3.86 3.00 Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0901
Title COMPOSITION
Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 713 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 1001
Title COMPOSITION

Title COMPOSITION Instructor: RAY, JENNIE

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 714 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anie	ncie	g		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	13	6	4.00	1148/1576	3.79	4.12	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	502/1576	4.16	4.22	4.27	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	955/1342	4.11	4.32	4.32	4.19	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	719/1520	4.12	4.32	4.25	4.09	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	5	9	3.86	1020/1465	3.89	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	8	13	4.39	534/1434	4.06	4.31	4.14	3.94	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	608/1547	3.97	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	20	4.74	795/1574	4.51	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	649/1554	3.90	4.08	4.10	4.01	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	970/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	582/1493	4.62	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	792/1486	4.22	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	1027/1489	4.05	4.24	4.32	4.22	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	963/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	532/1279	3.94	4.22	4.17	3.96	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	881/1270	4.23	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	644/1269	4.29	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	7	3	2	3.46	722/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.46
T - In a continue														
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	-	-	•	-	2 22	**** (024	2 02	2 02	4 00	4 00	ate ate ate ate
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 234	3.83	3.83	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	3.20	3.20	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 229	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21 8	0	0	0 1	2 1	0	1		****/ 232	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.27	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	U	U	Т	Τ.	13	1	3.88	332/ 379	3.77	3.85	4.20	4.15	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	2	1	0	3 33	****/ 85	3.50	4.58	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 72	3.00	4.13	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 80	3.75	4.43	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	17	3	0	3.15	268/ 375	3.24		4.01	3.78	3.15
o. Here orrectia for grading made orear	-	ŭ	Ū	Ü			ŭ	3.13	200, 373	3.21	3.23	1.01	3.70	3.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 48	3.50	3.50	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 44	3.50	3.50	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	3.75	3.75	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	1	0	14	1	1	3.06	249/ 326	3.19	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.06
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	0	1		****/ 40	3.75	4.38	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	3.50	4.25	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 35	3.50	4.25	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 28	3.75	4.38	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	13	0	2	3.27	266/ 382	3.19	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.27

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 1001 Title COMPOSITION Instructor: RAY, JENNIE

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 714 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

27 Questionnaires: 24 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	3	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101
Title COMPOSITION

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 715

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22 Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 3 3.75 1345/1576 3.75 4.12 4.30 4.11 3.75 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 3 4 1 $3.00 \ 1523/1576$ 3.00 4.22 4.27 4.18 3.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 7 1 0 3 0 1 $3.00 \ 1294/1342$ 3.00 4.32 4.32 4.19 3.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 1 3 2 3 $3.00 \ 1362/1520$ 3.50 4.32 4.25 4.09 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 1 4 4 1 3.08 1372/1465 3.08 4.16 4.12 4.02 3.08 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 2 6 2 3.58 1178/1434 3.58 4.31 4.14 3.94 3.58 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 3 2 5 1 0 2.36 1524/1547 2.36 4.07 4.19 4.10 2.36 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 606/1574 4.83 4.43 4.64 4.59 4.83 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1524/1554 3.15 4.08 4.10 4.01 3.15 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 1 1 3 2 2 3.33 1418/1488 4.00 4.35 4.47 4.41 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 1255/1493 4.51 4.72 4.73 4.65 4.51 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1386/1486 3.73 4.30 4.32 4.26 3.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 6 2 1 3.44 1332/1489 3.81 4.24 4.32 4.22 3.81 3 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 3 0 3 4 0 2.80 1203/1277 3.40 3.63 4.03 3.91 3.40 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 3 1 3.45 1085/1279 3.45 4.22 4.17 3.96 3.45 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 1 2 2 6 4.18 860/1270 4.18 4.49 4.35 4.09 4.18 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 4 1 6 4.18 858/1269 4.18 4.48 4.35 4.09 4.18 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 3 4 3 3.73 648/ 878 3.73 4.02 4.05 3.91 3.73 1 Laboratory 0 0 3.00 ****/ 234 **** 3.83 4.23 4.08 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.20 4.35 4.29 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0 0 1 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.00 4.51 4.43 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 0 6 0 4.00 229/379 4.00 3.85 4.20 4.15 4.00 5 1 0 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 1 00 1 0 3.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.69 4.52 **** 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.13 4.64 4.43 **** 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.43 4.61 4.55 **** 10 0 0 0 2 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1 3.25 245/ 375 3.25 3.25 4.01 3.78 3.25 4 0 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.00 4.48 4.20 11 0 0 Ω 1 Ω 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11 0 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 3.50 4.40 4.11 **** 0 1 0 11 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 44 **** 3.50 4.73 4.71 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 45 **** 3.75 4.57 4.72 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 11 0 0 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4 0 8 0 0 3.00 251/326 3.00 3.07 4.03 3.64 3.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.38 4.60 4.44 **** 11 0 0 0 1 0 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.25 4.83 4.71 **** 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.25 4.67 4.68 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.38 4.78 4.65 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 1 0 0 3 0 0 3.00 313/382 3.00 3.22 4.08 3.86 3.00

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

Baltimore County

COMPOSITION Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 12

Page 715 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General		Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Page 716
Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	4	1		1523/1576	3.00	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	3	0	1		1294/1342	3.00	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	4	1	3.08	1372/1465	3.08	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1178/1434	3.58	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1524/1547	2.36	4.07	4.19	4.10	2.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.43	4.64	4.59	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1132/1554	3.15	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	5		1150/1493	4.51	4.72	4.73	4.65	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	2		1003/1486	3.73	4.30	4.32	4.26	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2		1020/1489	3.81	4.24	4.32		3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	692/1277	3.40	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	1		1085/1279	3.45	4.22	4.17	3.96	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	860/1270	4.18	4.49	4.35	4.09	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	858/1269	4.18	4.48	4.35	4.09	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	648/ 878	3.73	4.02	4.05	3.91	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11 4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.07	4.03	3.64	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.00

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101 University of Maryland Page 716 Title COMPOSITION Baltimore County

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Spring 2009

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 12

22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101

COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Title Instructor: SIMS, DIANA

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 28

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 717

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Frequencies			_		tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	6	4	2	9	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.12	4.30	4.11	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	4	4	2	12	3.36	1456/1576	3.36	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	2	2	2	2	8	3.75	1132/1342	3.75	4.32	4.32	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	7	3	3	4	7	3.04	1464/1520	3.04	4.32	4.25	4.09	3.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	3	4	3	11	3.37	1302/1465	3.37	4.16	4.12	4.02	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	9	2	3	3	11	3.18	1335/1434	3.18	4.31	4.14	3.94	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	3	2	4	12		1353/1547	3.48	4.07	4.19	4.10	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	16	3	4	3	2		1573/1574		4.43	4.64	4.59	2.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	5	0	2	3	5	3.20	1405/1554	3.20	4.08	4.10	4.01	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	4	5	2	13		1380/1488		4.35	4.47	4.41	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	2	5	3	15		1441/1493	3.89	4.72	4.73	4.65	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	9	3		12		1342/1486		4.30	4.32	4.26	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	5	0	1	12		1415/1489	3.00	4.24	4.32	4.22	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	3	6	2	10	3.44	1047/1277	3.44	3.63	4.03	3.91	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	6	1	3	6		1219/1279		4.22	4.17	3.96	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	8	5	3	5		1196/1270	3.14	4.49	4.35	4.09	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	6	1	4	8		1154/1269	3.36	4.48	4.35	4.09	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	6	3	1	3	3	2.63	845/ 878	2.63	4.02	4.05	3.91	2.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60		****	3.20	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25		****	4.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	2	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	18	1	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.85	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	,	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25		****	4.13	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	1	14	1	1	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.25	4.01	3.78	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	2	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67		****	3.50	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	2	0	11	0	1	2.86	324/ 326	2.86	3.07	4.03	3.64	2.86
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67		****	4.38	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33		****	4.25	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	7	0	2	3.20	281/ 382	3.20	3.22	4.08	3.86	3.20

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101

Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN

Instructor: SIMS, DIANA

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 717 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Туре	Majors				
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0		
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28		
84-150	1	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 significant					
				I	0	Other	14	-					
				?	1								

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0101

Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 718 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
1 13	N was gain nor	General	ls from this course	0	0	2	2	7	9	6	2 /2	1474/1576	3.89	4.12	4.30	4.35	3.43
			the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	7	13		1119/1576		4.22	4.27		4.04
			the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	8	11		961/1342				4.41	
			the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	10	12		929/1520			4.25		4.19
			ite to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	18		395/1465			4.12		4.48
			bute to what you learne		0	1	1	6	14			1081/1434		4.31	4.14		3.78
		system clearly		3	0	1	0	5	11	8		1041/1547		4.07	4.19		4.00
		was class cance		1	0	0	0	1	2	24		567/1574				4.62	
			:11ed .l teaching effectivenes		0	0	1	6	12			1081/1554				4.02	
9. now	would you gi	rade the overal	i teaching effectivenes	5 4	U	U	1	0	12	5	3.00	1001/1554	4.20	4.00	4.10	4.05	3.00
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures		1	0	0	0	1	11		4.52			4.35	4.47		
			sted in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2		4.85			4.72	4.73		
			and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	10		4.26			4.30	4.32		4.26
			what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6		4.37	,			4.32		
5. Did	d audiovisual	techniques enh	ance your understanding	2	8	2	0	5	7	4	3.61	968/1277	4.05	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.61
		Discuss	ion														
1. Did	d class discus	ssions contribu	ite to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.50
			ouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3			4.55			4.49	4.35		4.55
			air and open discussion	8	0	0	1	2			4.45				4.35		
		chniques succes		8	9	2	2	3	3		2.91					3.92	
E Wax	co gritorio fo	Seminar or grading made		27	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 375	****	2 25	4 01	1 21	****
J. WEI	le Ciitelia i	or grading made	Clear	21	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	/ 3/5		3.23	4.01	4.21	
		Field W	Jork														
5. Did	d conferences	help you carry	out field activities	26	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****
		Self P	aced														
5. Wer	re there enoug		all the students	24	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
			Eno	~	. Dia	+ m i h											
			rre	quency	/ DIS	CLID	ullo	[]									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grade	S			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 7 6	0.00-0.99	0 A 8		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	5 5	1.00-1.99	0 B 12			-			-						,		
56-83	3 2	2.00-2.99	3 C 3		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 2	28	Non-	-major	28
84-15	50 1	3.00-3.49	6 D 0													-	
Grad.	. 0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
			P 1									respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot1	her					8						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0201 Title

INTRODUCTION TO LIT

ROCKETT, DANIKA Instructor:

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 719 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetion	naira

				eque		es			ructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	16	15	4.35	840/1576	3.89	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	20	4.56	542/1576	4.30	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	23	4.59	500/1342		4.32	4.32	4.41	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	24	4.59	418/1520	4.39	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	366/1465	4.49	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	12	17	4.39	534/1434	4.09	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	4	25	4.53	503/1547	4.26	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	21	8	4.09	1431/1574	4.47	4.43		4.62	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5 6	1	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	387/1554	4.20	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	638/1488	4.60	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3		4.84			4.72	4.73	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	-		4.72			4.30	4.32	4.29	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0		23	4.66	,		4.24	4.32	4.31	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	2				328/1277		3.63		4.01	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	_	1 02	****/1279	4 E0	1 22	1 17	1 11	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	0			****/1270		4.49		4.30	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	0			****/1269		4.48			***
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	1	0	0	1			****/ 878					***
T about the second														
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 379	***	3.85	4.20	4.29	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	***
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	5			Re	ason	ıs			Tyj	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	27	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101
Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

0

0

P I

Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 720 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		General															
		ew insights, skills fi		0	0	2	5	6	6	6		1489/1576		4.12	4.30	4.35	3.36
		ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	Ţ	6	6	12		1023/1576		4.22	4.27	4.32	4.16
		uestions reflect the		1	2 0	1	0	2 8	5	14		709/1342		4.32	4.32	4.41	4.41
		uations reflect the e eadings contribute to		2	3	3	2 6	8 6	5 1	8 6		1218/1520 1379/1465	3.83	4.32 4.16	4.25	4.26 4.09	3.83 3.05
		signments contribute		0	0	2	2	8	7	6		1197/1434		4.10	4.14	4.09	3.52
		g system clearly expl	-	1	0	0	3	4	5	12	4.08	985/1547		4.07	4.14	4.22	4.08
		was class cancelled	lained	1	0	2	3	13	6	12		1568/1574		4.43	4.64		2.96
	_	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	9	6	•		1277/1554			4.10		3.57
J. 110	would you	grade one everall ee		-	Ü	Ü	_		ŭ	-	3.37	12,7,1331	3.37	1.00	1.10	1.05	3.37
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	2	2	6	10	5	3.56	1381/1488	3.56	4.35	4.47	4.44	3.56
2. Did	<u> </u>				0	1	0	5	8	11	4.12	1395/1493	4.12	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.12
3. Was	d the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear				0	1	0	10	6	8	3.80	1233/1486	3.80	4.30	4.32	4.29	3.80
	s lecture material presented and explained clea: d the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	1	1	5	11	7		1200/1489	3.88	4.24	4.32		3.88
5. Did a	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				14	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	1077/1277	3.36	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.36
		Discussion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contribute to	what vou learned	15	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	4.22	4.17	4.14	3.40
		nts actively encourage		17	0	1	1	0	3	3		1054/1270	3.75	4.49	4.35	4.30	3.75
		ctor encourage fair a		16	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1029/1269	3.78	4.48	4.35	4.29	3.78
4. Were	special te	echniques successful	-	17	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	***	4.02	4.05	3.92	***
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria :	for grading made clea	ar	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	***
												,					
		Self Paced															
5. Were	there enou	ugh proctors for all	the students	22	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 11:	- 1	1				_					_						
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 	
00-27	1	A 21		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	в 0						-						_		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 2	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 231 0101

INTRO WORLD LIT. I

Title Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 721 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vo	u gain n	General www.insights.skills	from this source	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	429/1576	4.65	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.65
_	-	ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	653/1576		4.12	4.27	4.32	4.48
				0	0	0	1	1	11						4.32	4.41	4.40
	_	estions reflect th	=		-	-					4.30	797/1342		4.32			
		ations reflect the		0	1	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.73
			to what you learned	0	0	0	•	0	5	18	4.78	187/1465		4.16	4.12	4.09	4.78
			te to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7		4.43	486/1434		4.31	4.14	4.06	4.43
		g system clearly ex	-	0	0	0	2	3	8		4.13			4.07	4.19	4.22	4.13
	-	was class cancelle		0	0	0	0	0	15	8		1253/1574	4.35	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.35
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall t	teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.50
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures we	ell prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	846/1488	4.52	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.52
		ctor seem intereste		1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.91
			nd explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50
		es contribute to wh		1	0	0	0	1			4.82				4.32		4.82
			ce your understanding		13	1	0	2	0		4.11				4.03		4.11
J. Dia aa	arovibua.	r ccenniques ennanc	se your understanding	_	13	_	O	_	Ü	O	1.11	013/12//	1.11	3.03	1.05	1.01	1.11
		Discussion															
			to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2			4.47			4.22	4.17	4.14	
			raged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	3		4.44		4.44	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.44
		_	and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5		4.74	467/1269	4.74	4.48	4.35		4.74
4. Were s	special te	echniques successfu	ıl	5	9	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.33	4.02	4.05	3.92	3.33
		Laboratory	7														
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequate b	background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made cl	lear	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	***
		Field Work	2														
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute t	to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	***	4.00	4.48	4.74	****
	_		evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	3.50	4.40	4.71	****
_	-	ctor available for		22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.69	****
		could you discuss		22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	***	3.75	4.57	4.64	****
			at field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03		****
		6.36. =	- 3														
1 5'1	1.6	Self Pace		0.0	0	0	•	_	0	-	F 00		and and	4 22	4 60	F 00	****
	-	-	to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	Τ.		****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	5.00	
		cions make clear th		22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors for al	ll the students	17	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5		Re	auir	ed f	 วะ M	 aior		 5	Graduat	 e	 0	Majo	 r	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	В 13		100	-1411	- L	O1 11	⊥∪ر ت	~	_	Gradac	_	J	1100) (-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0		Ge	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0				•				-	2		-		,	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		E1.	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
oraa.	<u>~</u>	3.33 1.00 3	P 0				. 25				-	respons				_	
			I 0		O+1	her					6	TCCCOID	x	JC DIGI			
			1 0		00.						5						

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101

Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI

Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 722 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	MB	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	11	4	16	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	18	4.41	759/1576	4.41	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	22	4.52	572/1342	4.52	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	23	4.55	464/1520	4.55	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	169/1465	4.82	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	10	16	4.27	659/1434	4.27	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	8	19	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	22	9	4.21	1353/1574	4.21	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	8	21	4.45	932/1488	4.45	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	223/1493	4.97	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	20	4.48	719/1489	4.48	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	8	5	12	4.16	608/1277	4.16	3.63	4.03	4.01	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	344/ 878	4.29	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.29
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.74	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	***
Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				D.O	ason	a			Ту	ne			Majors	•
						- 								,
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 21 28-55 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 7		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	6
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 2														0.77
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 7 D 0		Gei	nera.	1			1	. 0	Under-g	rad 3	3	Non-	-major	27

Other

10

I

0

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101

Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 723 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	928/1576	4.27	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	11	6	4.00	1138/1576		4.22	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	912/1342	4.14	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	707/1520	4.38	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	399/1547	4.62	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574	4.95	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	742/1554	4.22	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	995/1488	4.41	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	3	7	7	3.80	856/1277	3.80	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	406/1279	4.56	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	361/ 878	4.27	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	\$

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101 University of Maryland

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

34

Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE Baltimore County Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 724

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1 Did you gain new	General v insights,skills fro	m this course	0	0	0	Ω	0	8	21	4.72	335/1576	4 72	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.72
	or make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.45
	estions reflect the e		0	0	0	1	0	6	22	4.69	381/1342	4.69	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.69
_	ations reflect the ex	_	0	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	614/1520	4.45	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.45
	adings contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	143/1465	4.86	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.86
6. Did written assi	ignments contribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	16	4.41	511/1434	4.41	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.41
7. Was the grading	system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	624/1547	4.45	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.45
8. How many times v	vas class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	14	14	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.50
9. How would you gr	rade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	272/1554	4.65	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.65
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	ctor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.71
	or seem interested i		1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00
	erial presented and e		1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.79
	s contribute to what		1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.82
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	2	17	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.00
	Discussion					_										
	ssions contribute to		9	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	343/1279	4.65	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.65
	s actively encourage		9	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.90
	or encourage fair an	d open discussion	9 9	0	0	0 1	0 6	4 5	16	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.48	4.35		4.80
4. Were special ted	enniques successiui		9	U	U	1	ь	5	8	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.00
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria fo	or grading made clear	•	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	***
	Field Work															
5. Did conferences	help you carry out f	ield activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****
3. Dia conferences	neip you carry out i	Tera activities	20	Ü	o	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 320		3.07	1.05	1.15	
	Self Paced															
5. Were there enough	gh proctors for all t	he students	24	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
		Frequ	ien <i>c</i> v	. Diet	trib	utio	n									
		11040	ciicy	DIS	CIID	acioi										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Tyj	pe			Majors	1
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13		Red	guir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	16
28-55 2	1.00-1.99 0	В 8			1			5						5		
56-83 7	2.00-2.99 4	C 4		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 2	29	Non-	major	13
84-150 11	50 11 3.00-3.49 6 D 0										_					
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - I				_	h
		P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
		I 0		Otl	her				1	9						
		? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101 Title

INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI

Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 13 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 725 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equer	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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course		0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	595/1576	4.36	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.54
		ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	462/1576	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.62
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals		0	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.60
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals		0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	339/1520	4.49	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.67
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learn	ned	0	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1095/1465	3.53	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.77
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you lea	arned	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	243/1434	4.49	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.69
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained		0	1	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1347/1547	3.69	4.07	4.19	4.22	3.50
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	4.97	4.43	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effective	eness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	692/1554	4.20	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.27
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared		3	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	995/1488	4.20	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.40
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject		3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clear	rly	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	678/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.50
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	_	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	921/1489	4.21	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.30
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understand	ding	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.01	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learn	ned	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	262/1279	4.80	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.75
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participa	ate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	4.85	4.49	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discuss	sion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	4.96	4.48	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful			5	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	4.44	4.02	4.05	3.92	5.00
		Self	Paced																
5. Were t	there eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students		12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
					Freque	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Omedia	3 a a d	G., G.7.3		Flore and a 2 Co		-			Des		_			m				Madace	
Credits E	sarnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	rades 				кеа	asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8			Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 0															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0			Gei	nera	l				3	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0															

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0201

INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI

Title Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 726 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			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	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1035/1576	4.36	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1107/1576	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1342	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	792/1520	4.49	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learne	ed 0	0	2	2	4	7	2	3.29	1329/1465	3.53	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear	ned 0	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	636/1434	4.49	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	1167/1547	3.69	4.07	4.19	4.22	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.97	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven	ess 1	0	0	0	1	12	3	4.13	849/1554	4.20	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1233/1488	4.20	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.95	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	y 7	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1057/1489	4.21	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi	ng 7	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.01	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne	ed 4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	199/1279	4.80	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat	.e 4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	478/1270	4.85	4.49	4.35	4.30	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi	on 4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	222/1269	4.96	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	570/ 878	4.44	4.02	4.05	3.92	3.88
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
F	requency	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Farned Cum GDA Fynested Gra	dea			P.e.	agon	c c			T'17	ne			Maiors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101

Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR

Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 727 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Ouestion	.s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1			Genera	_		•	0	0	0	0	•	0	1 61	455 /1556	4 6 4	4 10	4 20	4 25	4 6 4
					m this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	457/1576		4.12	4.30	4.35	4.64
					pected goals xpected goals	0 1	0	0	1	4 0	2	4 2		1286/1576	3.82 ****	4.22	4.27	4.32	3.82 ****
					pected goals	0	8 0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	****/1342 837/1520		4.32	4.32	4.41	4.27
					what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	0	7	4.27	837/1520	4.27 4.09	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.27
					o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7				4.16	4.12		4.09
			ystem clearl			0	0	1	3	3	1	3		368/1434 1427/1547	4.55 3.18	4.31	4.14	4.06	3.18
			s class cand		inea	1	1	0	0	5	3			, -			4.19		3.18
					hi	3	U T	0	0	0	3 4			1553/1574 395/1554		4.43			
9. HC	ow wou	id you gra	de the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.50
			Lectur	е															
			or's lecture			6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.40
2. Di	id the	instructo	r seem inter	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.75	4.60
					xplained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.60
			contribute t			6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.40
5. Di	id aud	iovisual t	echniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.01	****
			Discus	gion															
1. Di	id cla	ss discuss			what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.14	5.00
					d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.30	5.00
					d open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.25
			niques succe			7	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	3.92	****
			- ,																
E Wa			Labora	-	early specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 379	****	2 0 5	4 20	4 20	***
5. We	ere re	quirements	TOT TAD TEP	OILS CI	early specified	10	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 3/9		3.05	4.20	4.29	
			Semina	r															
5. We	ere cr	iteria for	grading mad	e clear		8	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.25	4.01	4.21	3.00
			Self	Paced															
5. We	ere th	ere enough	proctors fo		he students	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.39	****
					T		- 54			_									
					Frequ	iency	/ Dist	tribi	utioi	n									
Credi	its Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ty	рe			Majors	;
00-2	 27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	2
28-5	55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			_			-						3 -		
56-8	83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	9
84-1	150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				-	
Grad	d.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
					I 0		Otl	her					4			_			
					? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201
Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY Baltimore County SHIVNAN, SALLY Spring 2009

Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 728 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General															
1.	Did you	ı gain ne		ls from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	98/1576	4.78	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.95
2.	Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	406/1576	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.65
				the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1342	4.88	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.88
4.	Did oth	ner evalī	ations reflect	the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	249/1520	4.88	4.32	4.25	4.26	4.75
5.	Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	te to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	304/1465	3.97	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.60
6.	Did wri	tten ass	signments contri	bute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	114/1434	4.91	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.89
7.	Was the	grading	system clearly	explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	351/1547	4.03	4.07	4.19	4.22	4.65
8.	How man	y times	was class cance	lled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	567/1574	4.89	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.85
9.	How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	436/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.47
			Lecture															
1.	Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	638/1488	4.03	4.35	4.47	4.44	4.69
				sted in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493		4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00
				and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	339/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	4.75
			_	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	297/1489	4.32	4.24	4.32	4.31	4.81
5.	Did aud	liovisual	l techniques enh	ance your understanding	4	3	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	780/1277	3.60	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.92
			Discuss	ion														
1.	Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	te to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	236/1279	4.84	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.79
				ouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	208/1270		4.49	4.35		4.93
			_	air and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	222/1269	4.96	4.48	4.35	4.29	4.93
			echniques succes	_	6	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	276/ 878	4.51	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.42
			Self P	aced														
5.	Were th	nere enou	agh proctors for	all the students	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.22	4.08	4.39	***
				Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
C -	41 E = =		G 677		-					_			_				25-2-	_
Cre	dits Ea	ırnea 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке:	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
	-27 -55	0 5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 A 8 0 B 8		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301

INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Title

Instructor: MABE, MITZI J

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 729 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	485/1576	4.78	4.12	4.30	4.35	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1138/1576	4.32	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	4.88	4.32	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.88	4.32	4.25	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	1	4	3.33	1317/1465	3.97	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	88/1434	4.91	4.31	4.14	4.06	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	6	1	3	3.42	1376/1547	4.03	4.07	4.19	4.22	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.89	4.43	4.64	4.62	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	805/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	1	3	3.36	1413/1488	4.03	4.35	4.47	4.44	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	3	4		1253/1486	4.25	4.30	4.32	4.29	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1222/1489	4.32	4.24	4.32	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1099/1277	3.60	3.63	4.03	4.01	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.84	4.22	4.17	4.14	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1270	4.96	4.49	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269	4.96		4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	187/ 878	4.51	4.02	4.05	3.92	4.60
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	****	also also also also	4 60	4 60	4 50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.21	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 E0	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 48	****	3.50	4.48	4.74	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	3.50	4.40	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 45	****	3.75	4.73	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 326	****	3.75	4.03	4.43	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	тт	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	/ 320		3.07	4.03	4.43	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.25	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 382	****	3.22	4.78	4.39	****
5. Here there chagn proceeds for all the buddies		_	J	J	_	J	_	3.07	, 302		J.22	1.00	1.55	

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301

Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY

Instructor: MABE, MITZI J

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 13

ABE, MITZI J Spring 2009

Page 729 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 300 0101 University of Maryland Title COMM/TECH - ANALYSIS

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 730 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN Enrollment: 25

Ouestionnaires: 18

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 4 2 11 4.28 928/1576 4.28 4.12 4.30 4.30 4.28 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 3 12 4.50 608/1576 4.50 4.22 4.27 4.28 4.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 1 8 4.89 191/1342 4.89 4.32 4.32 4.30 4.89 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 339/1520 4.67 4.32 4.25 4.25 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 264/1465 4.67 4.16 4.12 4.09 4.67 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 4 13 4.67 270/1434 4.67 4.31 4.14 4.15 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 5 11 4.50 527/1547 4.50 4.07 4.19 4.21 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 9 8 4.39 1219/1574 4.39 4.43 4.64 4.61 4.39 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 208/1554 4.73 4.08 4.10 4.09 4.73 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 463/1488 4.78 4.35 4.47 4.47 4.782. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 18 5.001/1493 5.00 4.72 4.73 4.70 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 4 14 4.78 311/1486 4.78 4.30 4.32 4.32 4.78 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 5 11 4.50 696/1489 4.50 4.24 4.32 4.34 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 1 1 3 4 7 3.94 769/1277 3.94 3.63 4.03 4.11 3.94 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 1 1 3 10 4.47 488/1279 4.47 4.22 4.17 4.20 4.47 2 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 487/1270 4.69 4.49 4.35 4.42 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 310/1269 4.88 4.48 4.35 4.41 4.88 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 0 0 3 1 9 4.46 245/878 4.46 4.02 4.05 4.09 4.46 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 379 **** 3.85 4.20 4.17 **** Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 326 **** 3.07 4.03 4.23 **** Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.22 4.08 4.24 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons ------00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 15 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 2.00-2.99 4 C 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 28-55 0 56-83 3 General 6 Under-grad 18 Non-major 3 84-150 4 Grad. 0 F 0 Electives 2 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 9 ?

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101

Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 18

MCKINLEI, KAIRI

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 731 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	2	0	2	2	7	2	3	3.13	1524/1576	3.61	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.13
2. Did th	ne instruct	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	2	3	5	3	3	3.13	1511/1576	3.56	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.13
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	2	6	3.53	1204/1342	3.59	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.53
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1424/1520	3.76	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.31
5. Did as	ssigned rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	933/1465	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.94
				o what you learned	1	1	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1353/1434	3.71	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.13
		system clearly		ined	1	0	1	2	7	5			1405/1547				4.21	
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	_	11			1339/1574				4.61	
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	4	0	6	6	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	1343/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.80
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	1321/1493	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.33
3. Was le	ecture mate	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1261/1486	3.92	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.73
		s contribute to			3	0	2	1	3	6	3	3.47	1325/1489	3.83	4.24	4.32	4.34	
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	13	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
		Discus	zion															
1. Did cl	ass discus			what you learned	5	0	3	1	5	1	3	3.00	1186/1279	3.58	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.00
				d to participate	5	0	0	1	5	1			990/1270				4.42	
				d open discussion	5	0	2	2	3	1			1148/1269				4.41	
		chniques succe			5	4	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	776/ 878		4.02	4.05	4.09	3.22
		T = la =	.															
1 Did +h	o lab ing	Labora	_	of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 234	****	2 02	4.23	4.24	****
				early specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 379			4.23		****
J. Were I	equifemen	cb for fab fep	0100 01	edity bpecified		J	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 3,,,		3.03	1.20	1.17	
		Semina	r															
5. Were o	criteria fo	or grading made	e clear	•	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
		Field	Morle															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
E More +	howe ones	Self : gh proctors fo:		ho atudonta	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	2 00	****/ 382	****	2 22	4 00	1 21	****
5. Were t	liere enoug	gn proctors to.	r all t	ne students	10	U	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	****/ 382		3.22	4.08	4.24	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		P.C.			or Ma		 ,	2	Graduat		 0	Majo		7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	А 5 В 7		Ke(4utr.	EU I	⊃T IΔIÇ	STOLE	•	4	Graduat	_	J	ria JC	,T	/
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad '	18	Non-	major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		GCI	u.	-				_	onaci 'g.			14011	٠٠٠٠ عا	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	there a	re not	enoug	h
				P 1									respons					
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	4	_		_			
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201 University of Maryland Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG

MCKINLEY, KATHE

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 732

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ι

0

0

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	1089/1576	3.61	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.10
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	4	8	7		1138/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
		estions reflec			0	0	1	3	4	6	6		1169/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	3.65
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	902/1520		4.32	4.25	4.25	4.21
				what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	15	4.45	454/1465	4.20	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.45
				o what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	625/1434	3.71	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.30
		g system clearl			0	0	0	3	3	3	11	4.10	971/1547	3.70	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.10
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1367/1574	4.22	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.20
				hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	9	6	4.00	924/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
				_														
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	810/1488	4.18	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.55
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	810/1493	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.80
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	1069/1486	3.92	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.10
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	12	4.20	997/1489	3.83	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	18	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	732/1279	3.58	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.17
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	1	2	1	5	9	4.06	915/1270	3.99	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.06
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	2	1	6	9	4.22	835/1269		4.48	4.35	4.41	4.22
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	5	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	584/ 878	3.53	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.85
		Self :																
5. Were tl	here enou	igh proctors for	r all t	he students	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 10		_			-	J						3 -		-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	

Other

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101
Title ART OF THE ESSAY
Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 733 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22				
Questionnaires:	19	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	682/1576		4.12	4.30	4.30	4.47
		ctor make clear	-		0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	811/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	4.37
		estions reflec			0	17	0	0	0	1	1		****/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	****
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	281/1520		4.32	4.25	4.25	4.72
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	571/1465		4.16	4.12	4.09	4.33
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	176/1434		4.31	4.14	4.15	4.78
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	2	5	3	9		1041/1547		4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	281/1574		4.43	4.64		4.95
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	307/1554	4.61	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.61
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture			5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	,		4.35	4.47	4.47	4.71
		ctor seem inter		3	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493		4.72	4.73	4.70	4.86
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.57
		es contribute t	-	•	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	4	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	262/1279		4.22	4.17	4.20	4.75
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	288/1270		4.49	4.35	4.42	4.88
				d open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1		4.75	444/1269		4.48	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	10	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	742/ 878	3.40	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.40
		Self																
5. Were th	here enou	agh proctors for	r all th	ne students	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Freq	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor		1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 9						J								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_j h
				P 0									respons					
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.3	-		5			
				? 0			-				_							

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101 Uni Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 734 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	3		NF	٤ :	NA	Fre	equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_			_		_		_									
		w insights,ski			(0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	387/1576		4.12	4.30	4.30	4.68
		ctor make clear			(•	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	364/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	4.68
		estions reflec			(0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	381/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	4.68
		ations reflect			. (0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	562/1520		4.32	4.25	4.25	4.47
				hat you learned			0	0	0	0		17	4.89	127/1465		4.16	4.12	4.09	4.89
				what you learn			1	-	0	2	5		4.50	398/1434		4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50
		g system clearly		nea	(0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	827/1547		4.07	4.19	4.21	4.26
		was class cance			(0	-	0	0	18	1		1441/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	4.05
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overa	II teach	ing effectivene	ess 3	3	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	571/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38
		Lecture	_																
		actor's lecture	_	-	()	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	1064/1488	4.32	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.32
		ctor seem inter			()	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
				plained clearly	7 ()	0	0	0	4	1	14	4.53	654/1486	4.53	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.53
		es contribute to			()	0	0	1	1	1	16	4.68	474/1489		4.24	4.32	4.34	4.68
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance yo	ur understandir	ng 1	L	13	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1260/1277	2.20	3.63	4.03	4.11	2.20
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1 2	2	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	393/1279	4.59	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.59
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	574/1270	4.59	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.59
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	on 2	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	596/1269	4.59	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.59
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	2	2	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
		Self	Paced																
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for	r all th	e students	16	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Fr	requenc	777	Dist	rih	ıt i oı	า									
					-	-1	DIBC			-									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	des				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	!
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9			Req	uire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	s	1	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			-	_			-								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1			Gen	eral					1	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0										_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0			Ele	ctiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
				P 0										respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0			Oth	ıer				1	.7						
				? 0															

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101
Title BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA

BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA Baltimore County DONOVAN, JULIE Spring 2009

Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 735 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L																
1. Did y	ou gain n	new insights,skil	lls fro	m this cou	ırse	0	0	0	2	1	6	16	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.44
2. Did th	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goa	als	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	555/1576	4.54	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.54
3. Did th	he exam q	questions reflect	the e	xpected go	als	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	744/1342	4.36	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.36
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goa	als	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	487/1520	4.52	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.52
		eadings contribu				0	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	277/1465	4.64	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.64
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contri	ibute t	o what you	learned	0	0	0	1	2	11	11	4.28	647/1434	4.28	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.28
7. Was t	he gradin	ng system clearly	y expla	ined		0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	363/1547	4.64	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.64
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			0	1	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1295/1574	4.29	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.29
9. How w	ould you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effec	tiveness	4	1	0	0	3	11	6	4.15	816/1554	4.15	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.15
		Lecture	2																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well :	prepared		1	0	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	932/1488	4.46	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.46
		ctor seem intere			iect.	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	501/1493			4.73	4.70	4.91
		terial presented				1	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	891/1486		4.30	4.32	4.32	
		es contribute to				1	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	955/1489		4.24	4.32	4.34	4.25
		al techniques enh				1	6	2	0	6	3	7	3.72	909/1277	3.72	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.72
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribu		what vou l	earned	3	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	617/1279	4.32	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.32
		ents actively end				3	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77				4.35	4.42	
		ctor encourage f				3	0	0	0	0	3		4.86	321/1269		4.48	4.35	4.41	
		echniques succes		a open are	,00001011	3	1	1	1	3	7	9	4.05	456/ 878				4.09	
		Seminar	r																
5. Were	criteria	for grading made				24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
		Self F	Paced																
5. Were	there end	ough proctors for		he student	s	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	***
					Freq	nencs.	r Die	trib	ıti oı	n									
					1104	acricy	DIS	CLID	uc101										
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2		Ger	nerai	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	25	Non-	-maior	5

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101

Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO

Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 736 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	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 you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1203/1576	3.94	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	8		1067/1576	4.11	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	658/1342	4.44	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	837/1520	4.28	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	594/1434		4.31	4.14	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	4	- 6	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	7	4	3.82	1117/1554	3.82	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	1077/1493	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1017/1486	4.18	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	801/1489	4.41	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	681/1279	4.23	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	749/1270	4.38	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	793/1269	4.31	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
Seminar														
	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	++++/ 275	****	2 25	4 01	4 10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Ι/	0	0	0	Τ	U	0	3.00	****/ 375	^^^	3.25	4.01	4.12	* * * * *
Frequ	anas	r Diet	-rih	1+101	2									

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9 9	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR STEWART, CAROLE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

32

Spring 2009

Page 737

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

								equei			_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Question	.S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	728/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	4.43
		uestions reflec		1 3	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	510/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	4.57
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	562/1520		4.32	4.25	4.25	4.48
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	200/1465		4.16	4.12	4.09	4.76
	-	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	840/1434	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.10
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	575/1547	4.48	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.48
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.60
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	805/1554	4.17	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.17
		Lectur																
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	nrenared	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	736/1488	4 62	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.62
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	1	2	16		1113/1493		4.72	4.73	4.70	4.62
				explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	936/1486		4.30	4.73	4.70	4.29
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	672/1489		4.24	4.32		4.52
				you rearned your understanding	1	-	0	3	1	3		3.73	909/1277		3.63	4.03		3.73
J. Dia aa	atovibaa.	r ccciniiques en	ilalice y	our understanding	_		O	5	_	5	-	3.73	JUJ/12//	3.73	3.03	1.05	1.11	3.73
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50			4.22	4.17	4.20	4.50
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	2	5	11				4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50
		_		nd open discussion	3		0	0	2	7	9		741/1269		4.48	4.35	4.41	
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		3	5	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	625/ 878	3.77	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.77
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
				·														
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6				_						_				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.6						

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101

Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR

Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 738 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	562/1520	4.48	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	225/1465	4.73	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	503/1547	4.52	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	638/1488	4.68	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	784/1493	4.82	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	514/1486	4.64	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1077/1277	3.37	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	401/1270	4.76	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1269	4.76	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	15	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
Freq	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ty	pe			Majors	5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-		_	
				2	1						

University of Maryland Page 739
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2 2 2	0 0 12	0 0 0	0 1 0	2 4 1	4 3 0	9 7 2		697/1576 1100/1576 ****/1342	4.07	4.12 4.22 4.32	4.30 4.27 4.32	4.30 4.28 4.30	4.47 4.07 ***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 1 1	1 0	1 0 0	1 2 0	2 2 4	3 2 1	8 10 11	4.07 4.25	1012/1520 647/1465 486/1434	4.07 4.25	4.32 4.16 4.31	4.25 4.12 4.14	4.25 4.09 4.15	4.07 4.25 4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 1 4	1 0 0	1 0 0	2 0 0	4 0 4	2 3 2	6 13 7	4.81	1276/1547 645/1574 732/1554	4.81		4.19 4.64 4.10	4.21 4.61 4.09	3.67 4.81 4.23
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7 8 7	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 1 2	1 1 1	9 7 7	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.72 4.30 4.24	4.73 4.32 4.32	4.70 4.32 4.34	4.40 4.90 4.67 4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	0	0	1	1		****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	641/1279 378/1270	4.29	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	3	0 6	0	2 1	1 2	3	10 2	4.36 3.75	760/1269 631/ 878	4.36 3.75	4.48	4.35	4.41 4.09	4.36 3.75
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16 16 16	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	5.00 5.00	****/ 85 ****/ 79 ****/ 80	****	4.58 4.67 4.43	4.72 4.69 4.61	4.67 4.69 4.22	* * * * * * * * * * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear Self Paced	15	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 375		3.25	4.01	4.12	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency	15	O .	0 +xib	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 382	***	3.22	4.08	4.24	***
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	iency	DIS	CLIL		n asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9		 Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 jor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	13
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 4 C 3 84-150 7 3.00-3.49 2 D 0		Ge	nera	ıl				6	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	4
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ecti her	ves				2 7	#### - 1 respons				_	h

Course-Section: ENGL 320 0101

Title TOPICS IN CT Instructor: WEXLER, LAURA

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101

Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH

Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 740 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did v	ou gain ne	w insights,skil		is course	1	0	Ο	1	1	7	12	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.43
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.52
		estions reflect	_	-	2	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	562/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	4.53
		ations reflect			2	1	0	0	3	5	11	4.42		4.42	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.42
		adings contribu			3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53		4.53	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.53
		signments contri			3	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50		4.50	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50
		system clearly			3	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	445/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.58
		was class cance	_		3	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1317/1574	4.26	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.26
		rade the overal		effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8			339/1554		4.08	4.10	4.09	4.58
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lectures	well prep	ared	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.80
		tor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.95
		erial presented		-	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.70
		s contribute to	_	-	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.80
		techniques enh			2	12	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.00
		Discuss																
		ssions contribu			7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.67
		its actively end			7	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.80
		tor encourage f		en discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.41	
4. Were	special te	chniques succes	sful		7	6	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.33
		Seminar	-															
5. Were	criteria f	or grading made	e clear		20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	***	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did c	onferences	help you carry	out field	activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
		Self P	aced															
5. Were	there enou	igh proctors for	all the s	tudents	17	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	E	xpected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 11		_							1	, -				
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera.	T				1	Under-g	rad 2	12	Non-	-major	14
84-150	2 0	3.00-3.49	4 2	D 0 F 0		m 7 .						0	инии •	Va	h			.la
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	∠	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				U	#### - 1				_	11
				P 0		Oth	202				1	.5	response	es lo E	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				3 U		ULI	161					.5						
				r U														

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101 University of Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH Baltimore C

Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA Spring 2009
Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 741
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain nev	w insights,skil	_	this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.57
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.43
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	t the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	209/1342	4.86	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.86
		ations reflect			1	1	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.17
				at you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	748/1465		4.16	4.12	4.09	4.15
				what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	2	4		1270/1434		4.31	4.14	4.15	3.38
		system clearly		.ed	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	657/1547		4.07	4.19	4.21	4.43
		was class cance		55	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa.	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1159/1554	3.77	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.77
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.86
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	936/1486	4.29	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the	e lecture:	s contribute to	o what yo	u learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.71
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance you	r understanding	0	9	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1260/1277	2.20	3.63	4.03	4.11	2.20
		Discus	ai on															
1 Did ala	es disam			at you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	802/1279	4 00	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.00
				to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0		4.71		4.71	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.71
				open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0		4.67	,	4.67	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.67
		chniques succes		opon disoussion	6	6	1	0	0	0			****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
_		-																
		Semina	=															
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were th	nere enoug	gh proctors for	r all the	students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.22	4.08	4.24	***
						- -	1		_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	tribl	ltlor	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 6		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r •	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5												3 -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	ner				1	2						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENGL 340 0101

Title MAJOR LITERARY TRADITI

Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 742 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

								-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Questions	; 		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.83
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00
	_	-		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3		4.73	218/1434	4.73	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.73
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.58
	_	was class cance	_	inca	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554		4.08	4.10	4.09	4.86
J. 110W WO	dia you	grade the overal	.i ceac	ning effectiveness	J	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	130/1334	1.00	1.00	4.10	4.00	1.00
		Lecture	:															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.80
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.90
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.80
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.80
				our understanding	2	5	1	1	1	0	2		1119/1277	3.20	3.63	4.03		3.20
J. Dia au	atovisaa.	i ceciniiques em	iance y	our understanding	2	J		1	Τ.	U	2	3.20	1119/12//	3.20	3.03	1.03	7.11	3.20
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	413/1279	4.56	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.56
				d to participate	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.33
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
		echniques succes		a open arbeassion	3	7	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
1	PCCIAI C	COIMIT 4 GOD D GOOGL				•	Ū	ŭ	_	Ü	ŭ	3.00	, 0.0		1.02	1.00	1.05	
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was th	ne instru	ctor available f	or ind	ividual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribu	ite to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****
	_	ons contribute t		_	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43		4.22	****
		for grading made			9	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 375	****	3.25		4.12	****
J. WCIC C	ricciia .	ior grading made	CICAL			_	O	O	_	O	_	1.00	, 3,73		3.23	1.01	1.12	
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
				The early			lb		_									
				Frequ	епсу	ומות	rt TDJ	uLIOI	.1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 6		Ke(4utr.	cu I	or Mg	JOE	5	U	Graduat.	_	U	ria JC) <u> </u>	5
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	В 6 С 1		Cor	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non	-major	7
84-150	5		3	D 0		Ger	uera.	т				7	unaer-g.	ıau I	. 4	11O11-	-ma Jor	/
		3.00-3.49		= *		m2 -						^	- пппп -	\faa=== ±	h			.lo
Grad.						EIT€	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	111
				P 0									response	es to b	e sigr	niicar	1T	
				I 0		Oth	ner					4						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 350 0101

Title MAJ BRIT & AMER WRITER

Instructor: MCKINLEY, KATHE

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 743 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	18
Ouestionnaires:	14

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	S 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC	Level Mean	Sect
Questions	NK	NA	т т					mean	Rank	Mean	mean	mean	mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	840/1576	4.36	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	3.86	1529/1574	3.86	4.43	4.64	4.61	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1240/1554	3.64	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.64
T t														
Lecture	0	0	0	1	1	_	7	4 20	1007/1400	4 20	4 25	1 17	1 17	4 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	12		1087/1488 1077/1493	4.29 4.64	4.35 4.72	4.47 4.73	4.47 4.70	4.29 4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0 1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.77	325/1486	4.77	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.77	526/1489	4.77	4.24	4.32		4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	3	1		1020/1277	3.50	3.63	4.03	4.11	
5. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	1	,		U	_	3	1	3.30	1020/12//	3.30	3.03	4.03	4.11	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	774/1279	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	860/1270	4.18	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1076/1269	3.64	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	791/ 878	3.13	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.13
- 1														
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	**** / 270		2 05	4 00	4 1 7	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7					_	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101

Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE

Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 744 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	1	6	16	4.65	429/1576	4.65	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	476/1576	4.61	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	756/1520	4.35	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	143/1465	4.87	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	218/1434	4.73	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	4.39	1210/1574	4.39	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	436/1554	4.47	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.47
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	124/1488	4.95	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	86/1486	4.95	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	97/1489	4.95	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	812/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	355/1270	4.81	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	278/1269	4.90	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	0	2	10	6	3.90	557/ 878	3.90	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.90
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
5. Here there though proceeds for all the beautiful	22	J	•	J	_	0	J	3.00	, 302		3.22	1.00	1.21	
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	 7	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 369 0101 Title

RACE ETHNICITY US LIT

Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 745 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eque	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	on gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	324/1576	4.74	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.74
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74			4.22	4.27	4.28	4.74
		uestions reflec			0	15	0	0	0	0	4		****/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	****
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42		4.42	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.42
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	153/1465	4.84	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.84
	_	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68			4.31	4.14	4.15	4.68
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	4	15		207/1547		4.07	4.19	4.21	4.79
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	5		4.74			4.43	4.64		4.74
				ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	, -		4.08	4.10	4.09	
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.94	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.94
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493		4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	,		4.30	4.32	4.32	4.76
		es contribute t			2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	,		4.24	4.32	4.34	
				our understanding	2	1	1	0	5	4	6	3.88			3.63		4.11	
J. Dia aa	aiovibua.	r ccciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	2	_	_	Ü	3	-	O	3.00	010/12//	3.00	3.03	1.05	1.11	3.00
		Discus											0.55 /4.050					
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	11				4.22	4.17	4.20	4.63
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63			4.49	4.35	4.42	4.63
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75			4.48	4.35		4.75
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	sstul		3	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.40
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	'owned	Cum. GPA		Ermosted Crades				Do					т.	~			Majaza	
E		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons				Ту:	 he			Majors	·
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera	.1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					8						
				? 2														

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101

CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI

Title Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 746 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	211/1576	4.85	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.85
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	194/1576	4.85	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.85
		uestions reflec			0	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.85	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.85
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	297/1465	4.62	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.62
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	134/1434	4.85	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.85
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	167/1547	4.83	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.83
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1554	4.91	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.91
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	385/1488	4.82	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.82
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493		4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	379/1486	4.73	4.30	4.32	4.32	
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	420/1489	4.73	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.73
				your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277		3.63		4.11	
		1	1															
1		Discus			0	•	0	0	•	0		F 00	1 /1050	F 00	4 00	4 1 5	4 00	F 00
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
		_	_	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91		4.91	4.48	4.35	4.41	
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssiul		2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	152/ 878	4.70	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.70
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	le clear		11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	10	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors fo		he students	10	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
a 1'	. ,	a ana		_	-								_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				8	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	ner					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101 Title

CREATIVE WRITING-POETR

Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 747 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	equei	ncies			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 n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	1494/1576	3.33	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.33
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did as:	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.33
		g system clearl		ined	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1500/1547	2.75	4.07	4.19	4.21	2.75
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1110/1554	3.83	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.83
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1406/1488	3.40	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.40
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1307/1486	3.60	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.60
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1298/1489	3.60	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.60
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	962/1279	3.75	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.75
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.25
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
		Labora																
5. Were re	equireme:	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	3.85	4.20	4.17	4.50
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria	for grading mad	e clear		4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	209/ 375	3.50	3.25	4.01	4.12	3.50
		Self																
5. Were th	here eno	ugh proctors for	r all t	he students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 1			anir	 ed f	or Ma	iors		0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1,00	datt.	cu I	J_ 1-1G		•	•	Gradad		J	1.10	<i>,</i> _	_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-c	rad	6	Non-	-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001	c.a	-				•	OHACE S	,	•	1,011		3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	-		=	P 0									respons				_	,
				I O		Otl	her					3					-	
				2 1								-						

? 1

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101

Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING

Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 748 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Ouestions					MR	NA	1	2 2	3	s 4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean			Mean	Mean
		Quescion																
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.40
-	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	668/1576	4.47	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.47
		estions reflec			1	7	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	972/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	4.00
		ations reflect			1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	579/1520	4.47	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.47
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	647/1465	4.25			4.09	4.25
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2		4.63					4.15	4.63
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	5	2			838/1547				4.21	
	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	1			328/1574				4.61	
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	3	11			1019/1554					
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		nrenared	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4 33	1048/1488	4.33	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.33
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	0		4.87				4.73		4.87
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6		4.40		4.40			4.32	
		s contribute t			1	0	0	1	1				660/1489				4.34	
				our understanding	1	5	0	1	0	5		4.20						
J. DIG au	aiovisuai	ceciniiques en	nance y	our understanding		J	U	_	U	J	1	4.20	303/12//	4.20	3.03	1.03	7.11	1.20
		Discus																
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	1		4.10		4.10		4.17		4.10
				d to participate	6	0	0	1	2	0			805/1270	4.30	4.49	4.35	4.42	
				d open discussion	6	0	2	0	1	1			992/1269	3.90			4.41	
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		6	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	***
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equirement		-	early specified	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
	-	-		• •														
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
		m: -14 :	ra1-															
F Did		Field		ield activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 326	****	2 07	4 02	4.23	++++
5. Dia co	nierences	neip you carr	y out i	leid activities	15	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	^^^^/ 326		3.07	4.03	4.23	
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for		he students	13	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
		_																
	lency	Dist	cribu	utior	ı													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	ason	s			Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2							ed fo			 S	 1	Graduate		0	Majo		3
	28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 11						1u116	=u (J⊥ 1VI	ajur	۵	_	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC	,_	3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	neral	1				4	Under-q	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	13
	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 7 D 0						-C- U	-				-	onaci 'gi		-	14011	٠٠	13
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						ectiv	7es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enoua	h
P 0						1110						-	response					
	I 0						ıer					9	I CDPOHB		c brgm			
	? 1											-						
	? 1																	

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101 University
Title FEATURE WRITING Baltimo
Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS Spr:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

24

University of Maryland Page 749
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Ctudont	Comman	Erroluntion	Ouestionnaire
Student	COULSE	EVATUAL TOIL	Ouestronnarre

Frequencies

				Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	OMBC	телет	Sect			
Questions						NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1 Did von	anin ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	Ο	0	2	3	11	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.56
					-	-	0	0	0	5			,					
		tor make clear			0	0	-	-	•	-		4.69			4.22	4.27	4.28	4.69
		estions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	, -			4.32		4.75
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.53
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	554/1465	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.36
6 Did wri	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							0	0	2	13	4 87	126/1434	4 87	4 31	4.14	4.15	4.87
	7. Was the grading system clearly explained							1	3	4	6		992/1547			4.19	4.21	
				Inea	0	2	0	0	-	-	-		, -					
	8. How many times was class cancelled							•	2	3			1033/1574		4.43		4.61	
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1 Wara th	o inatru	ctor's lecture		nronarod	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.79
						-	-	-					,					
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493		4.72			5.00
		-		xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0			4.79			4.30			
4. Did the	e lecture:	s contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	336/1489	4.79	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.79
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance v	our understanding	2	12	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.11	****
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1279	4.83	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.83
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2			326/1270				4.42	
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269					
				a open aiscussion					-	-			,				4.41	
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	sstul		4	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.50
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading mad	e clear		12	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.25	4.01	4.12	3.00
J. MOIO 01		or gradring mad	0 01001			ŭ	Ü	Ü	-	Ŭ	·	3.00	2017 313	3.00	3.23	1.01		3.00
		Field	Morele															
1 3	_								_	_	_					4 00	4 00	
5. Did con	iterences	help you carr	y out i	ield activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
		Self																
5. Were th	nere enoug	gh proctors fo	r all t	he students	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n													
Guadita Ha	Expected Grades				Das					m				Ma dana				
Credits Ea				Rea	asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						J						3 -		-
	56-83 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 1						neral	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Mo∽	-major	8
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					Ger	ner d.	L				۷	onder-g.	Lau I	. 0	MOI1-	-ıııa Jor	0
Grad. $0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0$						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	h
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
I 0						Ot1	her				1	1	-		_			
2 1						001					-	_						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Baltimore County Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 750

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	19		
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnair

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil	=	n this course	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	1420/1576	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.57
		tor make clear			0	0	1	0	4	0	2		1478/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	3.29
		estions reflect			0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	4.56	4.32	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.20	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	850/1465	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1033/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.86
7. Was th	. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1255/1547	4.24	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.71
8. How ma	. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How wo	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.85	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.67
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instri		_	prepared	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1476/1488	3.72	4.35	4.47	4.47	2.60
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	0	2	2		1411/1493		4.72	4.73	4.70	4.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	2	1	1	1		1392/1486		4.30	4.32	4.32	3.20
		es contribute to			2	0	1	1	2	0	1		1451/1489	3.62	4.24	4.32	4.34	2.80
			_	our understanding	3	2	0	1	0	0	1		1020/1277			4.03	4.11	3.50
		Discus				•	•			•	_						4 00	
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	Τ		1000/1279		4.22		4.20	3.67
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	784/1270		4.49	4.35	4.42	4.33
				d open discussion	4	0 2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.71	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00 ****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssiul		4	2	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
				Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27										ajors		0	Graduat		0	Majo		2
28-55						ке	quir	eu I	J⊈ IVIč	ajors	•	U	Graduat	=	U	Ma JC)T	۷
56-83	1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1					Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		00.	с.а.	-					onaci -g.	Luu	,	14011		5
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					E1	ecti	zes				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
91au. 0 3.30-4.00 3 P 0												-	respons				_	
I O						Ot.	her					4	10050110	00 2	91			
? 0																		

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201 University of Maryland Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 751

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	22					
Questionnaires:	11		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 0

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	5	3	1	3.18	1512/1576	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.18
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1237/1576	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.91
		uestions reflec			0	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	972/1342	4.56	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1179/1520	4.20	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.89
5. Did as	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1187/1465	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.64
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	878/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.00
		g system clearl		-	1	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	527/1547	4.24	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1309/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	4.27
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	3			1381/1554		4.08	4.10		3.29
	2			J														
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			5	0	0	0	2	2	2		1233/1488		4.35	4.47	4.47	4.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493		4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				5	0	0	2	1	1			1330/1486		4.30	4.32	4.32	3.50
		es contribute t			5	0	0	1	3	0	2		1313/1489	3.62	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	2	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1257/1277	3.15	3.63	4.03	4.11	2.25
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cl	agg dige			what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	910/1279	3.97	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.88
				d to participate	3	0	0	2	2	1	3		1107/1270	4.26	4.49	4.35	4.42	3.63
				d open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	894/1269	4.71	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.13
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	671/ 878		4.02	4.05		3.67
1. Were b	pecial	comingues succe	DDIGI		3	-	_	Ü	-	_	_	3.07	0717 070	3.72	1.02	1.05	1.05	3.07
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 4						 ajors		0	Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 5		ке	quir	eu I	OT Mg	TOUS		U	Graduat	=	U	Ma JC)T	Т
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Co	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Mon	-major	10
						Ge.	nera.	т				U	onder-9	ıau I	т	NOII-	·iiia JOE	10
					רים	0a+ -					1	инии -	Moona +	homo -	no+		.h	
Grad.											<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>							
						0+1	hom					8	respons	es lo D	e sign	ıııcar	IL.	
I 0						Ut.	her					0						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

11010	TEV EITOS & TROSTIENT
Instructor:	BENSON, LINDA K
Enrollment:	24

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 14

Page 752 JUL 2, 2009 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	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	757/1576	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	608/1576	3.90	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	406/1342	4.56	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.20	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	366/1465	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	345/1434	4.14	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	527/1547	4.24	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	331/1554	3.85	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	786/1488	3.72	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	849/1493	4.60	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	499/1486	3.78	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	614/1489	3.62	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	916/1277	3.15	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	582/1279	3.97	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.26	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	4.71	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	405/ 878	3.92	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.18
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
Frequ			trib	ıtior	n									
•	-													

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101 University of Maryland TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K Spring 2009 Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires:	2	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
& accertainate co	_	Doddon o	J G G T D G	_,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Queberennarre

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00

Page 753

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0201 University of Maryland TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County

Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K Spring 2009 Enrollment:

Title

DITE OTTINCITE.	3	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Guidha Ramada Guidean GDA - Ramadad Guidean				ъ.					m-				36 - d	

Page 754

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301 University of Maryland Baltimore County TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K

> P 0

I

0

1

Spring 2009

Page 755

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

3

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.67
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qı	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute '	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.33
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
		echniques succe		ia open arroadrion	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00
				P		- D-1	1		_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	utioi	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			J						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	0			
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0							-		_					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
																	_	

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Page 756 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies							Instructor		Dept	t 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	415/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.67
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2009

Page 757 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies	

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501

3

TUTORIAL IN WRITING

FALLON, MICHAEL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

		Frequenci			ncies	5		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	851/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1276/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1186/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	928/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.00

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

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 0601	University of Maryland	Page 758
Title	TUTORIAL IN WRITING	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Ingtructor:	ENTION MICHARI	Chrina 2000	Tob TDDD2020

Instructor: Job IRBR3029 FALLON, MICHAEL Spring 2009 Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation Que	stionnaire
-----------------	---	----------------	----------------	------------

			Frequencies			3			tructor	-		t UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1294/1342	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00

Credits Earned 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	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701 University of Maryland TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County SHIVNAN, SALLY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

2

Page 759 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Ouest	

			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	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878		4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00
_		<u> </u>	.,											

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0	General	U	onder grad	_	NOII-lila JOI	U
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0			re not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other					
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801 University of Maryland TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County

Page 760 Title JUL 2, 2009 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questions	naire

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.50

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901 University of Maryland TUTORIAL IN WRITING Baltimore County SHIVNAN, SALLY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

4

Page 761 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

:	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Oueskisna			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520		4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434		4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.78	4.48	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.09	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	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	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1001 Page 762 JUL 2, 2009 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING FITZPATRICK, CA Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

			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 from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.12	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.77	4.32	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.16	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.31	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.58	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.45	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	4.80	4.30	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.24	4.32	4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.61	4.22	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.94	4.49	4.35	4.42	5.00

1 0

1

Frequency Distribution

1

0

0

0

0 0

0 0

2 5.00

1 5.00

1/1269 4.78 4.48 4.35 4.41 5.00

1/ 878 5.00 4.02 4.05 4.09 5.00

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	0	0 1.00	379/ 379	1.00	3.85	4.20	4.17	1.00

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

3

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

Laboratory

4. Were special techniques successful

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County Instructor: SIMS, DIANA Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

26

University of Maryland Page 763
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair	ρ.

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fr 1	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did	~~!~ ~	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	0	0	3	2	6	1	6	2 20	1502/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.28
		ew Insignes,ski ctor make clear			0	0	2	4	4		3		1502/1576		4.12	4.27	4.28	3.20
		uestions reflec			0	11	0	1	1	3	2		1089/1342		4.32	4.32	4.30	3.86
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	3	2	7	6		1179/1520		4.32	4.25	4.25	3.89
				what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	8	3		1317/1465		4.16	4.12	4.09	3.33
				o what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	8	6		1081/1434		4.31	4.14	4.15	3.78
		g system clearl		-	0	0	2	4	0	3	9		1251/1547		4.07	4.19	4.21	3.72
	_	was class cand			0	0	13	4	0	0	1		1574/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	1.44
				hing effectiveness	0	1	2	2	4	6			1362/1554		4.08	4.10		3.35
	-	_		3														
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	2	0	5	4	6	3.71	1363/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.71
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	1210/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.50
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	2	1	5	7	3	3.44	1349/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.44
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	3	2	4	6	3	3.22	1387/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.22
5. Did av	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1006/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.53
1 5 1 1		Discus			1.0	0	0	0	-	-	2	4 40	FF4/10F0	4 11	4 00	4 1 1	4 00	4 40
				what you learned	13		0	0	Τ	1	3		554/1279			4.17	4.20	4.40
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	4		355/1270		4.49	4.35	4.42	4.80
		_		d open discussion	13 13	1	0	0 1	1	1 1	3 2		728/1269 ****/ 878		4.48	4.35	4.41	4.40
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssiui		13	Т	U	Т	U	1	2	4.00	^^^^/ 8/8	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	^^^
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A б			 quir					0	Graduat		1	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		кe	quil	EU I	J⊥ I*Ic	JUL	>	U	Graduat	C	_	Ma JC	,T	U
	56-83 4 2.00-2.99 4 C 0					Ge	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	7	Non-	major	18
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					00	c.a	-				_	onaci -g	144 1	,	14011		10	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Εl	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
91au. 1 3.30-4.00 2 F 0											-	respons				_	,	
P 0 I 0					Ot	her				1	2			5				

? 0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 764 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301

TECHNICAL WRITING

HARRIS, LINDA R

Title

Instructor:

Questions	NR	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	8	3	6	3.55	1427/15	576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	4	6		1405/15		3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	735/13		4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	4	10		1041/15		4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	1	1	4	5		1242/14		3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	8	8		878/14		4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	2	4	8		1316/15		3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	10	6	4		1549/15		4.12	4.43	4.64		3.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	2	3	5	1		1436/15		3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.02
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	4	9	4 24	1126/14	188	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	2	6	8		1398/14		4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	3	6	7		1101/14		4.35	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.11
							-								
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	7	6		1200/14		3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	404/12	2.7.7	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.40
Discussion	1-	^	^	^	1	•	4	4 40	E20 / 7 0	272	4 11	4 00	4 15	4 00	4 40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/12		4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50			4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/12		4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 8	378	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 2		****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 3	379	***	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/	85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 3	375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52	****	4.00	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	3.50	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	44	****	3.50	4.73	4.63	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 3	326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	40	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	***	4.25	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	28	****	4.38	4.78	5.00	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons					Тур	e			Majors	5
								2							
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 13		Rec	quir	ea I	or Ma	jor	5	2	Gradu	uale	!	0	Majo	ΣĽ	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 2 B 2		~		,				0	1			0			0.0
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 1														-ma 10x	22
84-150 14 3.00-3.49 6 D 0		Gei	nera	Т				2	Under	-gr	au z	2	MOII.	-major	22

P 1 responses to be significant I 1 Other 14 ? 0

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 765

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

ROCKETT, DANIKA Enrollment: 24

Title

Instructor:

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401

TECHNICAL WRITING

		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	1000/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.21
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	364/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.68
		estions reflect			0	11	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	270/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.74
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	587/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.32
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	252/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.68
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	445/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.58
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1219/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.39
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	532/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.40
		Lecture																
1 Waxa +h	a inata	Lecture actor's lectures	_	aranarad	0	0	0	0	0	1	1 5	4.79	442/1488	1 21	4.35	4.47	4.47	4 70
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.79			4.72	4.47		4.79
		0	0	0	0	0	5		4.74			4.30	4.73	4.32				
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	4	15	4.79	336/1489		4.24	4.32	4.34	
				our understanding	0	0	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	,				4.11	
3. 21d dd	21011044	c ccommiques cm	idiioc j	our under bounding	Ü	Ū	_	Ü	_		Ü		000, 11.	3.00	3.03	1.05		
		Discuss																
				what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	4		575/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.38
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	412/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35		4.75
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	567/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.63
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		12	4	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
				Frequ	ienci	7 Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									
				11040	aciic j	DID	C1 1D(20101										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 11						Pe	 quire		 วะ M	 la ior		0	Graduate		0	Majo		1
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						100	quii	Ju II	JI 11	ajoi	5	O	Graduace	-	O	Majo	-	_
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 2					Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-gr	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-			-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - N	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	rh
P 0													response				_	
I 0						Ot1	her				1	.7	-					
	? 1																	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING SINGH, YASHODA Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 21

Page 766 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

							Fr	equei	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	4	1	4	6	6	3.43	1474/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.43
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	2	7	8	3.86	1264/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.86
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	709/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.40
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	826/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.29
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	0	0	2	1	1	8	9	4.00	850/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	878/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	explair	red	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	978/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.10
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.95
				ng effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1260/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.61
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	well pr	repared	3	0	1	3	2	4	8	3.83	1334/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.83
		ctor seem intere			3	0	1	1	0	7	9	4.22	1366/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.22
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	1222/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.83
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what yo	ou learned	3	0	5	0	2	6	5	3.33	1363/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.33
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance you	ır understanding	3	1	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	953/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.65
		Discuss																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	at you learned	10	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1143/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.27	
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	to participate	10	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1030/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	3.82	
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	open discussion	10	0	2	0	4	1	4	3.45	1129/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.45	
4. Were s	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus Were special techniques successful						0	1	2	2	2	3.71	654/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.71
		Laborat	cory															
		crease understar			19	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****
		structor provide			20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
	_	Self F																
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for	all the	e students	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	0	A 15		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	4	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3			-			-						, ,		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	19
84-150	9	D 0									J				_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.3	_		_			
				3 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County

Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 23

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 767

	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
--	---------	--------	------------	---------------

						Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights, skills i	rom this course	1	0	3	5	4	5	5	3.18	1512/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.18
		tor make clear the		1	0	0	1	5	7	9		1082/1576		4.22	4.27	4.28	4.09
		estions reflect the		1	8	1	2	4	3	4		1209/1342			4.32	4.30	3.50
		ations reflect the		1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	891/1520			4.25	4.25	4.23
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribute t	o what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1067/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.81
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	8	7	3.86	1027/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.86
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly exp	lained	1	0	1	0	7	4	10	4.00	1041/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancelled	l	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	813/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.73
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall to	aching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	5	9	4.10	876/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.10
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures wel	l prepared	4	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	1142/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.21
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem interested	l in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1029/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.68
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	4	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1101/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to wha	it you learned	4	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1262/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.74
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	5	2	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	889/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.75
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribute t	o what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	918/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.86
2. Were a	ll studen	ged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	881/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.14	
3. Did th	e instruc	and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	882/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.14	
4. Were s	pecial te		16	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****	
		Laboratory															
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab reports	clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	***	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant to t	he announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was th	e instruc	tor available for	ndividual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contribute t	o what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute to wh	at you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made cle	ear	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
		Self Paced	l														
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for all	the students	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
			·														
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 15 B 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	4	C 0		Cor	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	23	Non	-major	23	
84-150	3	2.00-2.99 2 3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Gel	пета	т				U	onder-9	Lau .	د ع	MOI1-	iiia jul	43
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		ਸ ੀ	ecti	Ves				1	#### -	Meane ·	there =	ire not	enous	rh
orau.	J	3.30 1.00 0	P 0		51	CCLI	v CD				_	respons				_	1
			I O		Ot.1	her				1	7	10000110	_~				
			? 0							_							

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 768 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			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
Gamana 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	11	2	3.50	1445/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	5	5		1380/1576	3.79	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00		4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	994/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	5	3	3	2.80	1426/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	787/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	6	3	4		1435/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0		13	7		1245/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	9	1	3.44	1331/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1329/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	1210/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1		10	5	3.85	1215/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	6	4		1313/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	958/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1064/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	928/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	999/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 375	***	3.25	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	208/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	3.60

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801 Title TECHNICAL WRITI

TECHNICAL WRITING or: HICKERNELL, MAR

Instructor: HICKERN

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 768 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 769 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	682/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	434/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	583/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	487/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	688/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	314/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	375/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	987/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	331/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	547/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	582/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	366/1486	4.15	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	856/1489	3.93	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	438/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	575/1279	4.11	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	747/1269	4.28	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	400/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	***	3.50	4.29	4.16	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	4.12	***
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.25	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	4.25	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.38	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901

Title TECHNICAL WRITING Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 769 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1001

20

TECHNICAL WRITING

JAMAL, MAHBUB

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

Page 770 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	g		NR	NA	Fr	equei 2			5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	829/1576	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.37
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	653/1576	3.99	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.47
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	5	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	430/1342	4.27	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.64
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	320/1520	4.31	4.32	4.25	4.25	4.68
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	277/1465	3.83	4.16	4.12	4.09	4.65
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	167/1434	4.23	4.31	4.14	4.15	4.79
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	963/1547	3.98	4.07	4.19	4.21	4.11
8. How t	many times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	488/1574	4.12	4.43	4.64	4.61	4.89
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	571/1554	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	786/1488	4.24	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.58
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	1				1089/1493	4.55	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.63		
		xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	,		4.30	4.32		4.61		
			0	0	0	0	0			4.58					4.34			
5. Did a	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:						2	1	0	3	4	3.60	974/1277	3.88	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.60
		Discus																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2		4.67	,				4.20	4.67
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1			636/1270		4.49	4.35		4.50
				d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2			535/1269		4.48	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		13	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	3.84	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
		Self																
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors fo	r all th	ne students	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 382	3.60	3.22	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	0	 A 5		Rec		ed fo	 or Ma	 aior		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0		
28-55							1411	- A I	J_ 1.10	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	~	-	Gradac	_	~	1100	-	J
56-83							nera	1				2	Under-q	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	19
	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 5 D 0						u	-				-	onacı 9		-	1,011		
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh		
	-	3.50-4.00	1	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.l	ner				1	2		~			-	
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101 University of Maryland Title TECHNICAL WRITING

SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 771

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 12

			Fre	eane	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	0	2	5	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1372/1576	3.58	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	0	5	3.25	1337/1465	3.25	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	7	3.83	1045/1434	3.83	4.31	4.14	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	1	2	5		1329/1547	3.55	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9		645/1574		4.43	4.64	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	0	3		1227/1554		4.08	4.10	4.09	3.67
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.35	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1379/1493	4.18	4.72	4.73	4.70	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1265/1486	3.73	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	4	4	3.64	1290/1489	3.64	4.24	4.32	4.34	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	0	1	1	2		1198/1277		3.63		4.11	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.20	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.49	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	907/1269	4.10	4.48	4.35	4.41	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	425/ 878			4.05	4.09	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.83	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.20	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.00	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.50	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	3.85	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.58	4.72	4.67	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	44/ 72	4.67	4.13	4.64	4.53	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	64/ 80	4.33	4.43	4.61	4.22	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	3.25	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.50	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	3.50	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.75	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.07	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.38	4.60	4.83	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.25	4.83	4.89	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.25	4.67	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.38	4.78	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	3.22	4.08	4.24	5.00

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101 Title

TECHNICAL WRITING SLYTHOMPSON, AL

Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 771 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 394 0101 University of Maryland Page 772
Title TECHNICAL EDITING Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 9

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	_	UMBC		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	3	0	1	2.22	1571/1576	2.22	4.12	4.30	4.30	2.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1330/1520	3.60	4.32	4.25	4.25	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1364/1465	3.13	4.16	4.12	4.09	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	1407/1434	2.67	4.31	4.14	4.15	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1387/1547	3.38	4.07	4.19	4.21	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	4	1	1	1	2.44	1571/1574	2.44	4.43	4.64	4.61	2.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1534/1554	2.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	2.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1470/1488	2.75	4.35	4.47	4.47	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1454/1493	3.75	4.72	4.73	4.70	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1367/1486	3.38	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	0	2	2.63	1461/1489	2.63	4.24	4.32	4.34	2.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	987/1277	3.57	3.63	4.03	4.11	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.22	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1270	****	4.49	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	4.48	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	***	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
Self Paced														

Frequency Distribution

8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.22 4.08 4.24 ****

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

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101

Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI

Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 773 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questi	onna i	re
---------	--------	------------	--------	--------	----

			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			_		•	_			440/4556		4 4 4 4	4 00		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ι	0	2	11	4.64	443/1576		4.12	4.30	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	825/1576	4.37	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	430/1342	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	429/1520	4.47	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	187/1465	4.64	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	345/1434	4.35	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	207/1547	4.33	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574	4.46	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	752/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.21
Lecture														
	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.55	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	•	0	0	Ţ	11		-,					4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.81	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	3	4		1197/1486	4.14	4.30	4.32	4.41	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	4		1118/1489	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.63	4.03	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	381/1279	4.44	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	855/1270	4.46	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	728/1269	4.56	4.48	4.35	4.55	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.22
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0201

Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI

Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 774 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Qu	estionnaire
------------------------------	-------------

			Fre	equei	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	637/1576	4.57	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	798/1576	4.37	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.38
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	583/1342		4.32	4.32	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.47	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	366/1465	4.64	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	816/1434	4.35	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1167/1547	4.33	4.07	4.19	4.24	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1411/1574	4.46	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	504/1554	4.32	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	0	0	0	Λ	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.90	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6		1101/1493		4.72	4.73	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	851/1486		4.30	4.32	4.41	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489		4.24	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	0		****/1277		3.63	4.03	4.04	****
_,														
Discussion							_				4 00		4 0 4	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	Ι	3	3	4.29	641/1279		4.22	4.17	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5		458/1270	4.46	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	491/1269		4.48	4.35	4.55	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	4.22	4.02	4.05	4.33	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-	_		
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101 Univ

Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 775 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	0	2	2	12	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.46	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	85/1465	4.94	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	146/1434	4.81	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	8		1165/1574	4.44	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	_	o	O	Ü	-	,		1.07	203/1331	1.07	1.00	1.10	1.21	1.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1486	4.88	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	856/1277	3.80	3.63	4.03	4.04	3.80
J. Did addiovisual eccuniques cumanee your anderstanding	O	5	U	_	_	_	2	3.00	030/12//	3.00	3.03	1.05	1.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	187/ 878	4.60	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.60
I. Here special committees successful		-	Ū	ŭ	-	_	•	1.00	1077 070	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.55	1.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****
Freque		Dis	trib	ution	n									
-	-													

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	Α	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 431 0101 Title

SEMINAR:BRIT & AMER LI

Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 776 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Genera																
1 Did voi	u dain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.55
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	434/1576	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.64
		uestions reflec			0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.32	4.32	4.46	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	191/1520	4.82	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.82
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	169/1465	4.82	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.82
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	368/1434	4.55	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.55
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	179/1547	4.82	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.82
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.43	4.64	4.69	4.70
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	thing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67
	Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared																	
					9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.35	4.47	4.55	****
		ctor seem inter			9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1493	****	4.72	4.73	4.80	****
				explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1486	****	4.30	4.32	4.41	****
		es contribute to		-	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1489	****	4.24	4.32	4.38	****
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	***	3.63	4.03	4.04	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1279	****	4.22	4.17	4.31	****
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1270	****	4.49	4.35	4.53	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.48	4.35	4.55	****
		Semina																
	_	-		announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	52/ 85	4.82	4.58	4.72	4.77	4.82
				lividual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.69	5.00
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	41/ 72	4.73	4.13	4.64	4.64	4.73
		ons contribute			0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	42/ 80	4.64	4.43	4.61	4.52	4.64
5. Were ci	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		0	0	U	Ü	1	1	9	4.73	142/ 375	4.73	3.25	4.01	3.90	4.73
E Word +h	horo ono	Self : ugh proctors fo		ho students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****
5. Were tr	nere eno	ugn proctors to.	ı aıı u			-	Ü	Ü	-	U	U	3.00	/ 302		3.22	4.00	3.00	
				Frequ	lency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jor		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	11
28-55																		
56-83						Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	0
84-150																		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					8						
				? 0														

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

15

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 777 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

						Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	. anin na	General w insights,skil		this source	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	443/1576	4.64	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.64
		w insignes,ski. tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3 1	12	4.79	244/1576		4.12	4.27	4.35	4.79
		estions reflect			2	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.46	****
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	385/1520		4.32	4.25	4.38	4.62
					0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1465		4.16	4.12	4.22	5.00
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learn Did written assignments contribute to what you lea					0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71			4.31	4.14	4.30	4.71
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	5	1	8		882/1547		4.07	4.14		4.71
		was class cance	-	nea	0	0	0	0	0	7	7		1079/1574		4.43	4.19		4.50
	-				3	1	0	0	0	4	6							
9. How wou	iia you g	rade the overa.	II teacn	ing effectiveness	3	1	U	U	U	4	ь	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.60
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.75
		tor seem intere	_	_	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.92
				plained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67			4.30	4.32	4.41	4.67
		s contribute to			2	0	0	0	1	0		4.83		4.83	4.24	4.32		4.83
				ur understanding	2	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89					4.04	
J. Dia ada	21011041	ccciniiqueb cin	idilee 70	ar anacrocanaring	_	3	J	J	Ü	_	O	1.05	110/12//	1.05	3.03	1.05	1.01	1.05
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to w	hat you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1279	4.89	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.89
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		5	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.50
		Semina	_															
1 Maria	agianod +			announced theme	1 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 85	****	4.58	1 72	1 77	****
				vidual attention	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.58	4.72 4.69	4.77 4.69	****
						-	0	0	0	•	1		,	****				****
_		ns contribute t		you learned	13	0	-		-	0	1		****/ 80		4.43	4.61	4.52	
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	***
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were th	nere enou	gh proctors for		e students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Per	mir		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		100	2411	-u -l	,	، ــ ب	~	-	CIAGUAL	_	•	1.10.70	-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	0
84-150				GCI	.c.a.	-				•	onaci -g.	Luu I	-	14011		U		
Grad.					רום	ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Means +	here -	re not	enous	h	
Grau.					11.7.6	L L I \	(CD				J	respons				_		
	P 0 I 0				Otł	nor				1	3	respons	נט נט גט	c sign	ııııdı	LC		
1 U ? 1				JUI	TCT				1	J								
				;														

Course-Section: ENGL 448 0101 Title

SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU

Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 778 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncies	5		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 General															
1. Did voi	u gain n		s from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.12	4.30	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	1	1	5	2		1248/1576		4.22	4.27	4.35	3.89
			the expected goals	0	0 7	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342	****	4.32	4.32	4.46	****
			the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	2	4	4.14		4.14	4.32	4.25	4.38	4.14
			e to what you learne		0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56		4.56	4.16	4.12	4.22	4.56
			oute to what you lear		1	1	0	0	4	3	4.00		4.00	4.31	4.14	4.30	4.00
		g system clearly		0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	,	4.11	4.07	4.19	4.24	4.11
	-	was class cancel	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.43	4.64	4.69	5.00
			. teaching effectiver		2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40		4.40	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.40
		Lecture		2	0	0	0	-	0	_	4 60	666 (1.400	4 65	4 25	4 45	4 55	4 65
		uctor's lectures		3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67		4.67	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.67
2. Did the	3	0	0	0	1	0	5		1053/1493	4.67	4.72	4.73	4.80	4.67			
			and explained clearl	_	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60		4.60	4.30	4.32	4.41	4.60
			what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67		4.67	4.24	4.32	4.38	4.6
Did au	diovisua	l techniques enha	nce your understandi	ing 3	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.63	4.03	4.04	****
		Discussi	.on														
L. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribut	e to what you learne	ed 1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.22	4.17	4.31	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	1	1	6	4.63		4.63	4.49	4.35	4.53	4.63
		-			0 0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50		4.50	4.48	4.35	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful					5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00		4.00	4.02	4.05	4.33	4.00
	_																
1 Word 2	agianod :	Seminar	o the announced them	ne 8	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 85	****	4.58	4.72	4.77	****
			or individual attenti		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
			e to what you learne		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.64	***
							0		0	1		,					***
			what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	-	1		****/ 80	****	4.43	4.61	4.52	****
o. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	****
		Self Pa															
5. Were th	here eno	ugh proctors for	all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.22	4.08	3.88	****
			F	requency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Gra	ades			Re	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
																	. – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0 D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	t enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
			I 0		Ot:	her					6	_		_			
			3 0														

Course-Section: ENGL 473 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV CREATIVE WRTG:POET Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 779 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
Enrollment: 9

Enrollment: 9
Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 568/1576 4.56 4.12 4.30 4.46 4.56 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 568/1576 4.56 4.12 4.30 4.46 4.56 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 392/1576 4.67 4.22 4.27 4.35 4.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 0 0 4 3 4.43 683/1342 4.43 4.32 4.32 4.46 4.43 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 249/1520 4.75 4.32 4.25 4.38 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 1 6 4.44 454/1465 4.44 4.16 4.12 4.22 4.44 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 270/1434 4.67 4.31 4.14 4.30 4.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 4 2 2 3.56 1325/1547 3.56 4.07 4.19 4.24 3.56 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 8 1 4.11 1417/1574 4.11 4.43 4.64 4.69 4.11 1/1554 5.00 4.08 4.10 4.24 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 750/1488 4.60 4.35 4.47 4.55 4.60 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.72 4.73 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1486 5.00 4.30 4.32 4.41 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 500/1489 4.67 4.24 4.32 4.38 4.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1277 **** 3.63 4.03 4.04 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 184/1279 4.88 4.22 4.17 4.31 4.88 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 288/1270 4.88 4.49 4.35 4.53 4.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 00 0 3 5 4.63 567/1269 4.63 4.48 4.35 4.55 4.63 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 1 0 0 2 5 4.25 367/878 4.25 4.02 4.05 4.33 4.25 Self Paced

Frequency Distribution

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 7 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.22 4.08 3.88 ****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	L	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7	-				
				2	Ο							

Course-Section: ENGL 486 0101 Title

SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO

Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 780 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	г оо	1 /1 576	F 00	4 10	4 20	1 10	г оо
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.12	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	Ţ	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6 0	0	0	0 1	0	2	5.00 4.75	1/1342 249/1520	5.00 4.75	4.32	4.32	4.46	5.00 4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.32	4.25	4.38	5.00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	-		193/1434	4.75			4.22	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	•	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	,		4.31	4.14	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	-	-	-	2	6	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.07	4.19		4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.43	4.64		4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	0	U	U	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.43	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.72	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.30	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.63	4.03	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.48	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.58	4.72	4.77	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	4.13	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.43	4.61	4.52	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	3.25	4.01	3.90	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1		
84-150	2	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	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	7						
				?	0								

University of Maryland Page 781
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENGL 686 0101

3

TEACHING COMP

MCCARTHY, LUCIL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.12	4.30	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		608/1576		4.22	4.27	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.32	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.16	4.12	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.31	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		527/1547		4.07	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.35	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0			1/1493			4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2			1101/1486		4.30	4.32	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1118/1489				4.38	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	Λ	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.22	4.17	1 21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		636/1270		4.49	4.35	4.53	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1269	5.00	4.49	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		464/ 878		4.40	4.05	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successiul	U	1	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	404/ 8/8	4.00	4.02	4.05	4.11	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	here are not enough			
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	0	_					
				2	Λ								