

Course-Section: ENGL 100 01
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Pekarske,Nicole
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 609
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	7	0	3.42	1358/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	6	2	3.58	1293/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	976/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1270/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	997/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1201/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1252/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1257/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1330/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1191/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1316/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1265/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1168/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1053/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	508/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	827/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	655/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	532/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	923/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	976/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1252/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	849/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	887/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	652/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	856/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	183/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	181/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	185/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	107/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	63/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	58/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	56/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	62/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	56/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	36/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	33/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	27/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	29/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	27/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	1.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	30/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	20/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	3.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	28/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	20/ 20	2.00	2.00	4.60	4.49	2.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	15/ 15	2.00	2.00	4.61	4.31	2.00

Course-Section: ENGL 100 01
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Pekarske,Nicole
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 610
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 02
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Pekarske,Nicole
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 611
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	1182/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	920/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	579/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	799/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	332/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	459/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1343/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	942/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	970/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1047/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1232/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1185/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	490/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1032/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	581/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A 5	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1327/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	920/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1143/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	655/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	917/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	758/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	919/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	8	2	3.91	1405/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	6	0	3.50	1238/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1282/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	1229/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1160/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1198/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	881/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	856/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	988/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	720/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	2.00	2.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	2.00	2.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 03
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Pekarske,Nicole
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 612
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 04
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 613
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	6	4	3	3.11	1402/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	8	4	3.58	1297/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1088/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	6	2	7	3.47	1182/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	7	3.84	944/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	942/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	938/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	9	2	3.76	1081/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	1031/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	814/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	3	9	3.95	1095/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	10	5	4.00	1030/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	1078/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	691/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	12	4.47	578/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	648/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	267/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 2	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 13	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 04
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Brofman, Margare
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 614
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1310/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1141/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1054/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1076/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1057/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	758/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1228/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1125/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.70

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1228/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1055/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1209/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1185/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	859/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1106/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1032/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	612/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 10	Non-major 10
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 05
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 615
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	13	2	3.75	1257/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	1053/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	0	9	7	4.17	854/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	8	4	3.65	1091/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	11	6	4.05	785/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	2	12	4.20	842/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	9	1	3.79	1066/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	536/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	656/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	793/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	5	11	4.21	924/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	10	3	5	3.58	936/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	496/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	527/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	316/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	273/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 19	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 06
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 616
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	742/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	5	10	4.22	882/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1094/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	8	4	3.88	931/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	581/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	5	6	3.82	1130/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	978/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	797/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	506/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	607/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	406/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	574/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	566/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	856/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	501/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	195/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	2.00	2.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	2.00	2.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 06
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 616
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	6	3.89	1174/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	702/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	717/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	943/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	3	8	3.88	931/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	581/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	811/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1030/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	983/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	506/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	958/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	587/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	952/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	825/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	710/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	320/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	695/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	279/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	2.00	2.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	2.00	2.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 07
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 617
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 07
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 618
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	474/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	315/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	505/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	325/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	173/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	292/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	6	8	4.10	914/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1048/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	53/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	429/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	528/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	316/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	216/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	4	0	3	2	2	2.82	1128/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	2.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	2	13	4.26	573/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	2	11	4.21	755/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	415/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	308/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	2.00	2.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	2.00	2.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 07
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Dunnigan, Brian
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 618
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	13	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 08
 Title Composition
 Instructor: McGurrin, Anthon
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 619
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	654/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	489/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	380/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	319/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	352/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	527/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1291/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	341/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	941/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	904/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	253/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	615/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	288/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	152/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	508/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	250/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 09
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Wilkinson,Rache
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 620
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	243/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	157/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	223/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	91/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	554/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	133/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	946/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	181/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	400/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	250/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 10
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Putzel, Diane
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 621
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	963/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	364/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	325/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1015/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	292/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	775/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	291/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	341/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	398/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	290/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	815/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	493/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	4	7	4.00	710/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	158/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	195/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 10
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Ray, Jennie B.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 622
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	5	4	3.61	1306/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	1023/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1008/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	11	5	4.06	943/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	8	2	3.56	1143/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	748/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	3.94	1034/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	9	6	2	3.59	1198/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	1098/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	1161/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	879/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	1010/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	2	3	9	0	3.19	1055/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	853/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	660/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	839/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	527/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	General	15	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0	
				I	0	
				Other	0	
				?	0	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 11
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Putzel,Diane
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 623
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	839/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	413/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	207/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	9	5	3.70	1057/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	322/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	799/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	491/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	276/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	366/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	689/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	288/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	504/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	521/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	390/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	273/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.37
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	2.00	2.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	2.00	2.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 11
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Putzel, Diane
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 623
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	18	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 12
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Sorokin, Anissa
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 624
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	681/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	145/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	251/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	325/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	718/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	188/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	147/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	3	4.14	1316/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	328/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	398/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	264/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	290/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	159/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	100/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	218/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	229/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	316/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	142/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.64
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 12
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Sorokin, Anissa
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 624
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	11	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	585/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	436/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	514/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	591/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	3	2	3	10	4.11	736/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	302/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	568/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1269/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	442/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	902/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	958/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	587/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	689/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	632/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	428/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	727/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	648/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	494/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors		4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	3	B	9							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		13	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				

Course-Section: ENGL 100 15
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Shipka, Jody L.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 626
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	1022/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1116/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	665/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	4	3	3.29	1244/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	812/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	739/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	901/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	807/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.08

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	891/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	953/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1003/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	927/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.60

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	521/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	295/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 11	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 16
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Shipka, Jody L.
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 627
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	869/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	532/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	658/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	217/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	938/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	519/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	632/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1175/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.40

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	798/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	775/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	887/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	813/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.80

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	710/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	683/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 16
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Walters, April I
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 628
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1365/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1336/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1175/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1245/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1212/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	3	4	3.45	1153/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	1312/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1202/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1117/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1282/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	1272/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	4	3	3.78	1184/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1232/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1154/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	2.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	925/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1060/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1043/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	742/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 19
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Terhorst II,Ray
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 629
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	585/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	352/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	451/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	336/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	529/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	256/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	283/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	538/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	158/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	398/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	579/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	217/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	312/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	478/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	454/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	502/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	295/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	273/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	100/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	72/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	3	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	94/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	80/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	5	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	28/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 22
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Porter, Jane
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 630
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	8	8	4.05	1032/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	479/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	451/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	217/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	746/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	143/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	459/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	754/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	322/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	727/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	553/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	341/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	739/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	628/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	4	8	3.94	764/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	502/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	134/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	532/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.87
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	4.33	4.56	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	2.00	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	1.00	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	3.00	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	2.00	2.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	2.00	2.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 22
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Porter, Jane
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 630
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 25
 Title Composition
 Instructor: Dunnigan, Brian
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 631
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	839/1447	4.07	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	677/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	646/1241	4.31	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	705/1402	4.33	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	117/1358	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	455/1316	4.35	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	10	8	4.20	842/1427	4.19	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1048/1447	4.56	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	374/1434	4.16	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	698/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	317/1387	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	405/1386	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	299/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	0	0	5	2	3.56	943/1193	3.62	3.60	4.02	3.99	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	295/1172	4.17	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	0	16	4.72	373/1182	4.43	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1170	4.53	4.45	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	669/ 800	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	4.21	4.47	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	3.79	4.19	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	3.78	4.12	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	3.32	3.81	4.33	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	3.00	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	3.00	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.00	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	3.00	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	3.00	3.89	4.09	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General 14	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	468/1447	4.56	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	833/1241	4.18	4.30	4.33	4.25	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	579/1402	4.44	4.26	4.24	4.15	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	485/1358	4.38	4.05	4.11	4.03	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	681/1316	4.19	4.25	4.14	3.99	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.97	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	0	0	14	4.63	998/1447	4.63	4.49	4.69	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	849/1434	4.00	3.99	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	460/1387	4.73	4.25	4.46	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	889/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	549/1380	4.60	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	478/1193	4.25	3.60	4.02	3.99	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	428/1172	4.44	4.21	4.15	3.95	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	824/1182	4.11	4.41	4.35	4.18	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.45	4.38	4.17	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	726/ 800	3.22	3.88	4.06	3.95	3.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.18	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	42/ 186	4.80	4.12	4.48	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 187	4.80	3.81	4.33	4.37	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 168	5.00	4.56	4.20	4.29	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 27	****	1.00	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 20	****	2.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 15	****	2.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 110 01
 Title Composition ESL Studen
 Instructor: Taylor, Paul
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 632
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 01
 Title Introduction To Lit
 Instructor: Gwiazda,Piotr K
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 633
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	695/1447	4.43	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	323/1241	4.71	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	69/1358	4.93	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	20	4.57	373/1427	4.57	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	12	4.44	1124/1447	4.44	4.49	4.69	4.70	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	431/1434	4.43	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	276/1387	4.85	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	22	4.70	379/1386	4.70	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	312/1380	4.78	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	1	6	16	4.44	340/1193	4.44	3.60	4.02	4.04	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	675/1172	4.09	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	595/1182	4.45	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	427/1170	4.73	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	775/ 800	2.71	3.88	4.06	4.01	2.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 28	Non-major 27
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	2	10	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	792/1447	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	345/1241	4.70	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	530/1402	4.47	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	2	4	10	3.95	869/1358	3.95	4.05	4.11	4.12	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	3	8	3.89	915/1316	3.89	4.25	4.14	4.08	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	874/1427	4.15	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	9	10	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.49	4.69	4.70	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	6	5	1	3.29	1305/1434	3.29	3.99	4.10	3.97	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	1031/1387	4.26	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	889/1387	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	911/1386	4.21	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	831/1380	4.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	3	2	1	1	4	3.09	1076/1193	3.09	3.60	4.02	4.04	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	835/1172	3.85	4.21	4.15	4.12	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	803/1182	4.14	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	787/1170	4.21	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	726/ 800	3.22	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.56	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	1.00	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 20	****	2.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	2.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 226 01
 Title English Grammar Usage
 Instructor: Fitzpatrick, Car
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 634
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241 01
 Title Currents In British Li
 Instructor: Farabaugh,Robin
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 635
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	626/1447	4.48	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	11	4.17	929/1447	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	743/1241	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	579/1402	4.43	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	644/1358	4.22	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	10	8	4.13	729/1316	4.13	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	6	8	7	3.91	1077/1427	3.91	3.97	4.19	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	1066/1447	4.52	4.49	4.69	4.70	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	849/1434	4.00	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	881/1387	4.43	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	264/1387	4.95	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	927/1386	4.19	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	3	0	17	4.52	275/1193	4.52	3.60	4.02	4.04	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	566/1172	4.27	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	668/1182	4.36	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	687/1170	4.36	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	402/ 800	4.11	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.11

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 243 01
 Title Currents In American L
 Instructor: Benson,Linda K
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 636
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	869/1447	4.29	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	532/1447	4.55	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	380/1241	4.64	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	645/1402	4.41	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	127/1358	4.82	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	143/1316	4.58	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	319/1427	4.68	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	4.89	4.49	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	540/1434	4.42	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	383/1387	4.65	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	475/1387	4.92	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	379/1386	4.66	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	520/1380	4.62	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	509/1193	4.37	3.60	4.02	4.04	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	268/1172	4.62	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	391/1182	4.73	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	306/1170	4.76	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	142/ 800	4.52	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 9	Under-grad 24	Non-major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	10	18	4.33	790/1447	4.29	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	23	4.61	426/1447	4.55	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	439/1241	4.64	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	6	19	4.45	567/1402	4.41	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	29	4.82	132/1358	4.82	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	2	5	19	4.38	519/1316	4.58	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	27	4.73	228/1427	4.68	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	29	4.79	786/1447	4.89	4.49	4.69	4.70	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	341/1434	4.42	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	4	21	4.52	783/1387	4.65	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	369/1387	4.92	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	483/1386	4.66	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	5	22	4.62	520/1380	4.62	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	2	0	3	22	4.54	268/1193	4.37	3.60	4.02	4.04	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	0	3	15	4.55	350/1172	4.62	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	347/1182	4.73	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	459/1170	4.76	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	261/ 800	4.52	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.39
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.56	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	1.00	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	2.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	2.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ENGL 243 02
 Title Currents In American L
 Instructor: Hyman,Mark
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 637
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	33	Non-major	32
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 01
 Title Intro To Shakespeare
 Instructor: Osherow, Michele
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 638
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	342/1447	4.68	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	23	4.67	352/1447	4.65	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	357/1241	4.66	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	12	19	4.56	425/1402	4.72	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	102/1358	4.88	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	19	4.42	476/1316	4.46	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	11	20	4.52	446/1427	4.45	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	646/1447	4.92	4.49	4.69	4.70	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	8	17	4.43	431/1434	4.57	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	307/1387	4.85	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	341/1386	4.65	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	204/1380	4.72	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	427/1193	4.24	3.60	4.02	4.04	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	282/1172	4.83	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	198/1182	4.70	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	223/1170	4.58	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	187/ 800	4.76	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 33 Non-major 17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 250 01
 Title Into To Shakespeare-Ho
 Instructor: Orgelfinger,Gai
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 639
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	452/1447	4.68	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1447	4.65	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	427/1241	4.66	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	114/1402	4.72	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	102/1358	4.88	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	392/1316	4.46	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	632/1427	4.45	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4.92	4.49	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.57	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.85	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	539/1386	4.65	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	582/1380	4.72	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	555/1193	4.24	3.60	4.02	4.04	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	4.83	4.21	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	553/1182	4.70	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	763/1170	4.58	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	4.76	3.88	4.06	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 271 01
 Title Intro Creat Wrtg-Ficti
 Instructor: Levine,Elise
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 640
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	667/1447	4.45	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	479/1447	4.55	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	716/1427	4.30	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	17	1	3.95	1383/1447	3.95	4.49	4.69	4.70	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	623/1434	4.27	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	398/1387	4.78	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	159/1386	4.89	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	312/1380	4.78	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1182	4.79	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	3.88	4.06	4.01	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 12	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 273 01
 Title Int Creative Wtg-Poetr
 Instructor: Fallon,Michael
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 641
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	702/1447	4.39	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.30	4.33	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	369/1402	4.61	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.05	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	188/1316	4.72	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	2	2	2	7	3.67	1201/1427	3.67	3.97	4.19	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.49	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	765/1434	4.13	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	921/1387	4.39	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	420/1193	4.33	3.60	4.02	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	247/1172	4.71	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	382/1182	4.71	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 18	Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ENGL 291 01
 Title Intro Wrtg Creat Essay
 Instructor: McGurrin,Anthon
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 642
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	0	4	5	1	2.93	1423/1447	3.17	4.09	4.31	4.31	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	5	1	3.14	1385/1447	3.09	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	3	6	1	3.23	1335/1402	3.34	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	4	1	3	1	2.46	1340/1358	2.64	4.05	4.11	4.12	2.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	5	3	3.14	1243/1316	3.52	4.25	4.14	4.08	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	1339/1427	2.91	3.97	4.19	4.14	3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	10	3	0	3.14	1440/1447	4.34	4.49	4.69	4.70	3.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	5	1	2	2.92	1377/1434	3.08	3.99	4.10	3.97	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	1	4	2	2	2.77	1364/1387	2.89	4.25	4.46	4.42	2.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	0	6	5	4.00	1320/1387	4.28	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	6	1	2	2.85	1344/1386	2.95	4.17	4.32	4.24	2.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	0	4	3	1	2.62	1350/1380	2.88	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1193	1.69	3.60	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1019/1172	3.46	4.21	4.15	4.12	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1023/1182	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.30	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	864/1170	3.63	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 800	3.17	3.88	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 291 02
 Title Intro Wrtg Creat Essay
 Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 643
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	3	1	4	2	2.47	1440/1447	3.17	4.09	4.31	4.31	2.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	11	0	4	2	0	1.82	1446/1447	3.09	4.16	4.27	4.23	1.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	8	1	2	2	2	2.27	1396/1402	3.34	4.26	4.24	4.24	2.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	2	2	1	0	1.56	1357/1358	2.64	4.05	4.11	4.12	1.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	5	2	4	1	2.67	1288/1316	3.52	4.25	4.14	4.08	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	11	3	1	0	0	1.33	1425/1427	2.91	3.97	4.19	4.14	1.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.34	4.49	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	9	2	2	0	2	1.93	1431/1434	3.08	3.99	4.10	3.97	1.93

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	11	2	3	0	1	1.71	1387/1387	2.89	4.25	4.46	4.42	1.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	1332/1387	4.28	4.69	4.73	4.71	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	11	2	3	1	0	1.65	1385/1386	2.95	4.17	4.32	4.24	1.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	14	0	2	0	1	1.47	1380/1380	2.88	4.17	4.32	4.30	1.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	11	0	4	1	0	1.69	1186/1193	1.69	3.60	4.02	4.04	1.69

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	2	2	2	1	2.23	1162/1172	3.46	4.21	4.15	4.12	2.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	2	0	5	3.33	1113/1182	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.30	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	4	1	1	2	2.31	1165/1170	3.63	4.45	4.38	4.32	2.31
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	6	3	1	1	1	2.00	795/ 800	3.17	3.88	4.06	4.01	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 291 03
 Title Intro Wrtg Creat Essay
 Instructor: Fallon,Michael
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 644
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	998/1447	3.17	4.09	4.31	4.31	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	814/1447	3.09	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	459/1402	3.34	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	931/1358	2.64	4.05	4.11	4.12	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	158/1316	3.52	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	858/1427	2.91	3.97	4.19	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.34	4.49	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	491/1434	3.08	3.99	4.10	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1092/1387	2.89	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.28	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	784/1386	2.95	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	615/1380	2.88	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1193	1.69	3.60	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	247/1172	3.46	4.21	4.15	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	250/1182	3.97	4.41	4.35	4.30	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	538/1170	3.63	4.45	4.38	4.32	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	290/ 800	3.17	3.88	4.06	4.01	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 18 Non-major 14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 301 01
 Title Analysis Literary Lang
 Instructor: McKinley, Kathry
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 645
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	742/1447	4.16	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	619/1447	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	798/1241	4.24	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	685/1402	4.17	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	272/1358	4.45	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	392/1316	4.28	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	971/1427	3.82	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1346/1447	4.06	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	744/1434	4.04	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	641/1387	4.41	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	733/1386	4.28	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	637/1380	4.34	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1087/1193	2.58	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	546/1172	4.20	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	553/1182	4.45	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	798/1170	4.37	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	691/ 800	3.54	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	1128/1447	4.16	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1114/1447	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	782/1241	4.24	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	976/1402	4.17	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	572/1358	4.45	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	785/1316	4.28	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	7	3	3.65	1210/1427	3.82	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	12	2	4.07	1343/1447	4.06	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	969/1434	4.04	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	1071/1387	4.41	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	814/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	971/1386	4.28	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	971/1380	4.34	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1174/1193	2.58	3.60	4.02	4.05	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	672/1172	4.20	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	638/1182	4.45	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	554/1170	4.37	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	596/ 800	3.54	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 301 02
 Title Analysis Literary Lang
 Instructor: McKinley, Kathry
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 646
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 303 01
 Title Art Of The Essay
 Instructor: Sawyers, Seth A
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 647
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	12	9	4.32	810/1447	4.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	389/1447	4.64	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	452/1358	4.41	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	188/1316	4.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	13	4.32	704/1427	4.32	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	485/1447	4.91	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	442/1434	4.41	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	475/1387	4.72	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	496/1386	4.61	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	604/1380	4.56	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	302/1172	4.64	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	316/1170	4.82	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	308/ 800	4.30	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 304 01
 Title Brit Lit:Medieval/Rena
 Instructor: McKinley,Kathry
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 648
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	0	3	21	4.72	353/1447	4.72	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	2	19	4.56	468/1447	4.56	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	2	18	4.52	523/1241	4.52	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	518/1402	4.48	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	165/1358	4.76	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	7	15	4.46	444/1316	4.46	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	361/1427	4.58	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	22	3	4.12	1321/1447	4.12	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	797/1434	4.11	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	19	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	483/1386	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	19	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	16	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	672/1172	4.11	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	0	4	11	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	851/1170	4.11	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	3	1	2	2	5	3.38	688/ 800	3.38	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 01
 Title Brit Lit:Restor - Roma
 Instructor: Smith,Orianne M
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 649
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	14	4.44	667/1447	4.44	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	468/1447	4.56	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	323/1241	4.72	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	303/1402	4.68	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	117/1358	4.84	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	10	14	4.48	413/1316	4.48	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	486/1427	4.48	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	15	8	4.29	1228/1447	4.29	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	374/1434	4.48	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.48

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	414/1387	4.76	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	211/1387	4.96	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	457/1386	4.64	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	227/1380	4.84	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	480/1182	4.61	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	295/1170	4.83	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	494/ 800	3.92	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 17	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 5	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major 13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: ENGL 306 01
 Title Brit Lit: Victorian-Mo
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 650
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	963/1447	4.16	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	10	8	4.32	792/1447	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	523/1241	4.53	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	807/1402	4.21	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	187/1358	4.74	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	915/1316	3.89	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	823/1427	4.21	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1182/1447	4.37	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	5	7	6	3.89	989/1434	3.89	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.89

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	766/1386	4.39	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	537/1172	4.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	4	2	8	3.94	915/1182	3.94	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	679/1170	4.38	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	15	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 307 01
 Title Am Lit To Civil War
 Instructor: Stewart,Carole
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 651
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	7	7	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	911/1447	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	6	7	3.76	1065/1241	3.76	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	635/1402	4.38	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	861/1316	3.95	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	739/1427	4.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	8	10	3	3.76	1081/1434	3.76	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	921/1387	4.38	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	844/1387	4.76	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	4	4	9	3.86	1151/1386	3.86	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	997/1380	4.10	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1022/1193	3.33	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	450/1182	4.64	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	695/1170	4.36	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	621/ 800	3.64	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENGL 308 01
 Title Am Lit After Civil War
 Instructor: Berman, Jessica
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 652
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	489/1447	4.55	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	357/1241	4.68	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	655/1402	4.36	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	194/1358	4.73	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	497/1316	4.41	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	459/1427	4.50	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	803/1447	4.77	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	12	7	4.14	754/1434	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	0	17	4.70	946/1387	4.70	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	392/1386	4.70	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	326/1380	4.76	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	8	2	5	3.39	1005/1193	3.39	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	250/1182	4.85	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	275/1170	4.85	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	710/ 800	3.31	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.31	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	4.73	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	4.46	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	4.42	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	1.00	4.43	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	2.00	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	2.00	4.61	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 308 01
 Title Am Lit After Civil War
 Instructor: Berman, Jessica
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 652
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 315 01
 Title Studies In World Lit
 Instructor: Gwiazda,Piotr K
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 653
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	771/1447	4.35	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	741/1447	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	478/1241	4.57	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	249/1402	4.72	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	223/1358	4.68	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	150/1316	4.78	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	5	12	4.30	716/1427	4.30	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1018/1447	4.60	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	634/1434	4.25	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	698/1387	4.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	958/1387	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	470/1386	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	637/1380	4.53	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	4	0	1	7	3.50	960/1193	3.50	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	240/1172	4.73	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	316/1170	4.82	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 20	Non-major 12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENGL 324 01
 Title Theories Of Comm Tech
 Instructor: Maher, Jennifer
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 654
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	963/1447	3.79	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	947/1447	3.83	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	782/1241	3.83	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	635/1402	3.90	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	700/1358	4.08	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	8	3	3.92	890/1316	3.75	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	5	2	3.46	1271/1427	3.40	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1340/1447	4.13	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	807/1434	3.75	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.08

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1105/1387	4.08	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	982/1387	4.39	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	733/1386	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	749/1380	3.99	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	555/1193	4.08	3.60	4.02	4.05	4.17

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	350/1172	4.06	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	329/1182	4.32	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	364/1170	4.67	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	637/ 800	3.37	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	3	2	3.42	1358/1447	3.79	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1323/1447	3.83	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	2	2	3.42	1163/1241	3.83	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1283/1402	3.90	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	799/1358	4.08	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1097/1316	3.75	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	1	3	3.33	1312/1427	3.40	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1291/1447	4.13	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	3.42	1273/1434	3.75	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1176/1387	4.08	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1300/1387	4.39	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1220/1386	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1232/1380	3.99	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	652/1193	4.08	3.60	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	970/1172	4.06	4.21	4.15	4.24	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	968/1182	4.32	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	538/1170	4.67	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	733/ 800	3.37	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 326 01
 Title Structure Of English
 Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 656
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	700/1241	4.35	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	3	7	3	3.50	1264/1402	3.50	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	1	6	4	3.18	1268/1358	3.18	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	1	6	4	3.29	1214/1316	3.29	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	1034/1427	3.94	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1030/1447	4.59	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	5	7	3	3.69	1137/1434	3.69	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	10	5	4.12	1137/1387	4.12	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	934/1387	4.71	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	2	5	6	3.71	1209/1386	3.71	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1013/1380	4.06	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	879/1193	3.69	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	966/1172	3.58	4.21	4.15	4.24	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	932/1182	3.92	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	933/1170	3.92	4.45	4.38	4.49	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	710/ 800	3.30	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 1	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 351 01
 Title Studies In Shakespeare
 Instructor: Falco,Raphael
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 657
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	507/1447	4.57	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	741/1447	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	514/1241	4.54	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	207/1402	4.77	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1358	4.92	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	362/1316	4.54	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	422/1427	4.54	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1263/1447	4.23	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	540/1434	4.33	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	641/1387	4.62	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	496/1386	4.62	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	420/1380	4.69	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	566/1172	4.27	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	373/1182	4.73	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 364 01
 Title Persp On Women In Lit
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 658
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	1032/1447	4.06	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	7	5	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	929/1402	4.08	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	332/1358	4.53	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	748/1316	4.12	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	4	5	3.61	1223/1427	3.61	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	7	1	3.53	1223/1434	3.53	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	990/1387	4.31	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	369/1387	4.94	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1214/1386	3.69	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1081/1380	3.94	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	437/1172	4.44	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	804/1170	4.19	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	2	4	4	1	3.36	693/ 800	3.36	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.36
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 18	Non-major 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENGL 369 01
 Title Race Ethnicity US Lit
 Instructor: Stewart,Carole
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 659
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	313/1241	4.73	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	248/1316	4.65	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	200/1427	4.75	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	1124/1447	4.45	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	942/1434	3.94	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	769/1387	4.53	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	0	17	4.74	889/1387	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	649/1386	4.47	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	1	13	4.32	831/1380	4.32	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	555/1193	4.17	3.60	4.02	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	232/1172	4.73	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	415/1170	4.73	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	411/ 800	4.08	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 371 01
 Title Creative Writing-Ficti
 Instructor: Shivnan,Sally A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 660
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.30	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	249/1402	4.73	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	194/1358	4.73	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	188/1316	4.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	228/1427	4.73	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	988/1447	4.64	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	309/1434	4.56	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1386	4.90	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.21	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	86/ 800	4.83	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 2	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	1		
				? 0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	2	0	6	3.46	1347/1447	3.46	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	1344/1447	3.43	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	1	2	5	3.38	1292/1402	3.38	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1156/1358	3.54	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	950/1316	3.83	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	1	3	4	3.38	1297/1427	3.38	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	2	1	3.33	1293/1434	3.33	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1272/1387	3.70	4.25	4.46	4.44	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	1340/1387	3.90	4.69	4.73	4.71	3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	0	2	1	4	3.30	1293/1386	3.30	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1246/1380	3.50	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	843/1193	3.75	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	925/1172	3.67	4.21	4.15	4.24	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1005/1182	3.78	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	845/1170	4.11	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.56	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	4.73	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 380 01
 Title Intro To News Writing
 Instructor: Weiss,Kenneth N
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 662
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	6	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	766/1241	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	414/1402	4.57	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	1	6	3.53	1156/1358	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	13	4.63	274/1316	4.63	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	775/1427	4.25	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	727/1447	4.81	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	956/1434	3.93	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	839/1387	4.47	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	889/1387	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	510/1386	4.60	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	626/1380	4.53	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	616/1193	4.09	3.60	4.02	4.05	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	832/1182	4.10	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	941/1170	3.90	4.45	4.38	4.49	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	775/ 800	2.71	3.88	4.06	4.12	2.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 0						

Course-Section: ENGL 382 01
 Title Feature Writing
 Instructor: Corbett,Christo
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 663
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	820/1447	4.31	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	315/1447	4.69	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	567/1402	4.44	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1043/1358	3.73	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	265/1316	4.64	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1123/1427	3.83	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1060/1447	4.54	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	578/1434	4.31	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	891/1387	4.42	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.21	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 386 01
 Title Adult Literacy Tutorin
 Instructor: McCarthy, Lucill
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 664
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	1017/1447	4.07	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	187/1358	4.73	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	362/1316	4.53	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1055/1427	3.93	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.49	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	341/1434	4.50	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	741/1387	4.55	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	568/1386	4.55	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	615/1380	4.55	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	261/1172	4.69	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	261/ 800	4.38	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ENGL 391 01
 Title Adv Expos & Argument
 Instructor: Flanigan, Sean
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 665
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	474/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	500/1447	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	380/1241	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	542/1402	4.21	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	987/1358	3.80	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	434/1316	4.32	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	513/1427	4.00	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	4.27	4.49	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	611/1434	3.88	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	383/1387	4.08	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	278/1386	4.30	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	392/1380	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	652/1193	3.65	3.60	4.02	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	463/1172	4.10	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.49	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.62	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	366/ 800	4.31	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 02
 Title Adv Expos & Argument
 Instructor: Benson,Linda K
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 666
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	626/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	510/1447	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	427/1241	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	471/1402	4.21	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	10	4.05	772/1358	3.80	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	476/1316	4.32	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	763/1427	4.00	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	938/1447	4.27	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	786/1434	3.88	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	1055/1387	4.08	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1387	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	587/1386	4.30	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	905/1380	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	526/1193	3.65	3.60	4.02	4.05	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	675/1172	4.10	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	373/1182	4.49	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	501/1170	4.62	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	250/ 800	4.31	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major 14
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 1					

Course-Section: ENGL 391 03
 Title Adv Expos & Argument
 Instructor: Burns, Margie
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 667
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1214/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1005/1447	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1096/1241	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1120/1402	4.21	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1283/1358	3.80	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	700/1316	4.32	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1246/1427	4.00	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	1337/1447	4.27	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1337/1434	3.88	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1233/1387	4.08	4.25	4.46	4.44	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	829/1387	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	997/1386	4.30	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1260/1380	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1193	3.65	3.60	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	710/1172	4.10	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1011/1182	4.49	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	763/1170	4.62	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1214/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1308/1447	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	782/1241	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	976/1402	4.21	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	608/1358	3.80	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	644/1316	4.32	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1176/1427	4.00	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1435/1447	4.27	4.49	4.69	4.65	3.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	849/1434	3.88	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1317/1387	4.08	4.25	4.46	4.44	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	1272/1387	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1184/1386	4.30	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1162/1380	4.04	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1136/1193	3.65	3.60	4.02	4.05	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	801/1172	4.10	4.21	4.15	4.24	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	400/1182	4.49	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	327/1170	4.62	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	290/ 800	4.31	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.56	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	1.00	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	2.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	2.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 391 04
 Title Adv Expos & Argument
 Instructor: McGurrin, Anthon
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 668
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 01
 Title Tutorial In Writing
 Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 669
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.36	4.26	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	237/1358	4.03	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	4.29	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	971/1427	3.54	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1252/1447	4.60	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	3.83	4.25	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1143/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	3.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.14	4.17	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.70	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	4.90	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	742/ 800	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 670
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	532/1447	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.00	4.30	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.36	4.26	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.03	4.05	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	4.29	4.25	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	775/1427	3.54	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.60	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	3.83	4.25	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	3.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.14	4.17	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	4.70	4.21	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	4.90	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 03
 Title Tutorial In Writing
 Instructor: Shivnan,Sally A
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 671
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.36	4.26	4.24	4.24	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.29	4.25	4.14	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	3.54	3.97	4.19	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.60	4.49	4.69	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	3.83	4.25	4.46	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	3.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.14	4.17	4.32	4.32	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	4.70	4.21	4.15	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	4.90	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.12	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 07
 Title Tutorial In Writing
 Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 672
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	790/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1053/1447	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.36	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	4.03	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.29	4.25	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	971/1427	3.54	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.60	4.49	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1434	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1282/1387	3.83	4.25	4.46	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	811/1386	3.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	815/1380	4.14	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	4.70	4.21	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	4.90	4.41	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	655/ 800	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 08
 Title Tutorial In Writing
 Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 673
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1436/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1361/1447	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1359/1402	4.36	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.03	4.05	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1288/1316	4.29	4.25	4.14	4.13	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1418/1427	3.54	3.97	4.19	4.15	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.60	4.49	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1349/1434	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1383/1387	3.83	4.25	4.46	4.44	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1229/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1380/1386	3.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1371/1380	4.14	4.17	4.32	4.32	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 09
 Title Tutorial In Writing
 Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 674
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1290/1447	4.19	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1262/1447	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1215/1241	4.00	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1264/1402	4.36	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	4.03	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1200/1316	4.29	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1418/1427	3.54	3.97	4.19	4.15	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1202/1447	4.60	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1238/1434	4.14	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1380/1387	3.83	4.25	4.46	4.44	2.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.81	4.69	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1380/1386	3.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1246/1380	4.14	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	710/1172	4.70	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.90	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	742/ 800	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 01
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Diallo, Mamadou
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 675
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	4	5	4	5	3.19	1390/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.19		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	3	4	5	5	3.09	1391/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.09		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	3	2	5	4	3.24	1191/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.24		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	6	4	7	3.62	1223/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.62		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	3	2	11	3.71	1050/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.71		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	4	3	9	3.67	1050/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.67		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	3	6	7	3.62	1223/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.62		
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	819/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.76		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	7	4	1	2.94	1368/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	2.94		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	2	7	8	0	2.90	1358/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	2.90		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	2	4	6	7	3.67	1353/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	3.67		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	7	4	5	0	2.50	1367/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.50		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	6	3	2	6	2.91	1327/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	2.91		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	4	3	1	1	0	1.89	1182/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	1.89		
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	890/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	3.73		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	963/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.87		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	976/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	3.80		
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	624/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.63		

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 02
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Hickernell, Mary
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 676
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	11	4	3.89	1174/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	983/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1054/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	471/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	2	8	3	3.53	1161/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	486/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	1	5	7	3.71	1184/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	956/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1098/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	1125/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	1047/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	1030/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1076/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	648/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	803/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	640/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 03
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Harris,Linda R
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 677
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	12	1	2	2.73	1435/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	2.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	9	2	2	2.73	1422/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	2.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	7	6	3	3.18	1345/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	0	5	2	2	2.71	1334/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	4	7	5	3.32	1208/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	4	7	7	0	1	2.32	1410/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	2.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	4	7	7	3	3.32	1434/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	3.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	2	5	2	0	2.64	1397/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	2.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	5	7	4	3.50	1304/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	1282/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	5	5	4	3	2.95	1335/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	1	5	6	2	2.85	1332/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	2.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	4	2	4	3	3.13	1067/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1090/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1166/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1107/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.56	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	1.00	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	2.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	2.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 03
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Harris,Linda R
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 677
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 04
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Harris,Linda R
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 678
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	8	4	5	3.38	1363/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	6	2	7	3.33	1361/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	717/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	5	3	8	3.79	1148/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	4	0	4	2	2	2.83	1322/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	5	7	3.57	1101/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	5	1	5	4	5	3.15	1349/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	6	9	5	3.86	1409/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	9	2	4	3.35	1288/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	3	5	9	4.00	1176/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	1291/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	7	4	6	3.68	1214/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	7	4	5	3.40	1270/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	3	5	1	3	2.87	1122/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	2.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	8	3	3	3.11	1402/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	6	3	4	3.11	1391/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	6	7	5	3.94	1036/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	0	6	1	2	2.92	1315/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	7	7	3	3.76	991/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	7	2	4	5	3.39	1297/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	12	1	3.68	1425/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	3.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	10	2	0	2.87	1382/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	2.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	1233/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	7	5	3.94	1332/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	7	3	3	3.11	1321/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	8	3	3	3.22	1300/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	3	6	3	1	3.00	1087/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 19	Non-major 18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 393 06
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Sly-Thompson,Al
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 680
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	5	3	2	2.94	1421/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	1	3	4	3.00	1400/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1197/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	1	2	5	3	3.00	1359/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	1320/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1237/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	0	3	4	4	3.13	1354/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	565/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	5	4	2	0	2.58	1400/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	3	3	3	2	2.63	1371/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	2.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1345/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	4	3	4	1	2.63	1361/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	0	3	3	1	2.27	1366/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	2.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	5	0	3	0	3	2.64	1148/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	3	1	3	0	2.75	1138/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	1	3	1	3.25	1121/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	1	2	1	2.88	1144/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	2.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	733/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	3.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	3.00	4.57	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	2.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 06
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Sly-Thompson, Al
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 680
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 07
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Walters, April I
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 681
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	4	4	4	4	2.90	1426/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	2.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	6	3	3	2.81	1417/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	2.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1215/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	6	4	3.33	1307/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	2	5	4	2	2.78	1328/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	4	5	5	3.24	1228/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	7	4	5	3	1	2.35	1407/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	2.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	4.24	1263/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	4	6	3	0	2.56	1402/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	2.56

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	3	7	3	3	2.90	1358/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	2.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	4	4	9	3.95	1330/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	3.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	3	6	2	3	2.65	1358/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	8	2	3	2.80	1337/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	4	5	5	3	2	2.68	1144/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	2.68

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1144/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	803/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	958/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	787/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	2.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 5					

Course-Section: ENGL 393 08
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Rockett, Danika
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 682
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	869/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	401/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	882/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	358/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	980/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	519/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	319/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	958/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	420/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	712/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	758/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	483/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	699/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	478/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1121/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1137/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.47	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.12	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.81	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.56	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	3.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	2.00	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.00	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	1.00	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.00	4.72	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 08
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Rockett, Danika
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 682
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 09
 Title Technical Writing
 Instructor: Jamal, Mahbub
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 683
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	1	4	7	3	3.47	1345/1447	3.32	4.09	4.31	4.32	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1196/1447	3.40	4.16	4.27	4.23	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1047/1241	3.64	4.30	4.33	4.33	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	2	4	6	3	3.67	1203/1402	3.74	4.26	4.24	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	9	3	3.65	1097/1358	3.20	4.05	4.11	4.10	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	812/1316	3.73	4.25	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	5	7	2	3.35	1306/1427	3.29	3.97	4.19	4.15	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.36	4.49	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	5	2	2	3.36	1286/1434	3.19	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1272/1387	3.58	4.25	4.46	4.44	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	1300/1387	4.13	4.69	4.73	4.71	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	8	4	3.76	1188/1386	3.32	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1185/1380	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.32	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1032/1193	2.98	3.60	4.02	4.05	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	999/1172	3.31	4.21	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	979/1182	3.59	4.41	4.35	4.42	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	965/1170	3.59	4.45	4.38	4.49	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 800	3.32	3.88	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.19	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 01
 Title Method Of Interpretati
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 684
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.09	4.31	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	792/1447	4.31	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	683/1241	4.38	4.30	4.33	4.41	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	292/1402	4.69	4.26	4.24	4.34	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	306/1358	4.56	4.05	4.11	4.15	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	898/1427	4.13	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1321/1447	4.13	4.49	4.69	4.72	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	623/1434	4.27	3.99	4.10	4.17	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	712/1387	4.56	4.25	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1030/1387	4.63	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	775/1386	4.38	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	593/1380	4.56	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.21	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	836/1182	4.08	4.41	4.35	4.49	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	1	1	6	3.58	1039/1170	3.58	4.45	4.38	4.51	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 407 01
 Title Language In Society
 Instructor: Shipka, Jody L.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 685
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	0	2	3	4	3.23	1384/1447	3.23	4.09	4.31	4.43	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	3	4	2	3.00	1400/1447	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.31	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1163/1402	3.75	4.26	4.24	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	3	4	3.31	1240/1358	3.31	4.05	4.11	4.15	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	1	6	3.46	1149/1316	3.46	4.25	4.14	4.27	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	3	2	2	2.69	1383/1427	2.69	3.97	4.19	4.20	2.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	1340/1447	4.08	4.49	4.69	4.72	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	0	3	3	2	2.92	1377/1434	2.92	3.99	4.10	4.17	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1329/1387	3.31	4.25	4.46	4.48	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	1	1	9	4.15	1291/1387	4.15	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	1	3	3	1	2.67	1357/1386	2.67	4.17	4.32	4.34	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	0	5	3	3.15	1307/1380	3.15	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	813/1193	3.80	3.60	4.02	4.00	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	1034/1172	3.36	4.21	4.15	4.25	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	990/1182	3.82	4.41	4.35	4.49	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	3	4	2	3.36	1104/1170	3.36	4.45	4.38	4.51	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	701/ 800	3.33	3.88	4.06	4.19	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 410 01
 Title Seminar In Genre Studi
 Instructor: Smith,Orianne M
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 686
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	375/1447	4.70	4.09	4.31	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	345/1241	4.70	4.30	4.33	4.41	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.26	4.24	4.34	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	280/1358	4.60	4.05	4.11	4.15	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	76/1316	4.90	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	256/1427	4.70	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.49	4.69	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	96/1434	4.88	3.99	4.10	4.17	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.78	4.25	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.89	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.89	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	181/1380	4.89	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1172	****	4.21	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	****	4.41	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1170	****	4.45	4.38	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	4.17	4.58	4.87	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	31/ 62	4.78	4.16	4.56	4.80	4.78
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	27/ 58	4.67	4.10	4.41	4.59	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	25/ 65	4.78	4.05	4.42	4.55	4.78
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	18/ 64	4.67	3.89	4.09	4.43	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 451 01
 Title Seminar In Major Write
 Instructor: Falco,Raphael
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 687
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.09	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1005/1447	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.30	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	854/1402	4.17	4.26	4.24	4.34	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	122/1358	4.83	4.05	4.11	4.15	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.49	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.78	3.99	4.10	4.17	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1250/1387	3.82	4.25	4.46	4.48	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1010/1386	4.09	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	868/1380	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	566/1172	4.27	4.21	4.15	4.25	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	198/1182	4.91	4.41	4.35	4.49	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	501/1170	4.64	4.45	4.38	4.51	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	47/ 66	4.50	4.17	4.58	4.87	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	38/ 62	4.71	4.16	4.56	4.80	4.71
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	29/ 58	4.63	4.10	4.41	4.59	4.63
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	45/ 65	4.38	4.05	4.42	4.55	4.38
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	36/ 64	4.00	3.89	4.09	4.43	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 0						

Course-Section: ENGL 480 01
 Title Seminar-Adv Journalism
 Instructor: Corbett,Christo
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 688
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1447	4.86	4.09	4.31	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.16	4.27	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	****	4.30	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.26	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1358	4.57	4.05	4.11	4.15	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1427	5.00	3.97	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1423/1447	3.71	4.49	4.69	4.72	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1434	4.83	3.99	4.10	4.17	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.25	4.46	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1193	4.80	3.60	4.02	4.00	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.21	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.88	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 486 01
 Title Seminar In Teaching Co
 Instructor: McCarthy, Lucill
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 689
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	103/1447	4.94	4.09	4.31	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	327/1447	4.69	4.16	4.27	4.31	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.30	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.26	4.24	4.34	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.05	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	96/1316	4.87	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	513/1427	4.47	3.97	4.19	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.49	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	158/1434	4.75	3.99	4.10	4.17	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	140/1387	4.93	4.25	4.46	4.48	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1193	****	3.60	4.02	4.00	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	87/1172	4.93	4.21	4.15	4.25	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.41	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.45	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	146/ 800	4.64	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.17	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.16	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.10	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.05	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.89	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						