

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 642
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	2	6	5	2	3.06	1447/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	4	2	3.22	1386/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	3	3	3.00	1236/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	4	4	3	3.06	1399/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	3	4	3.06	1297/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	6	3	3.33	1225/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	6	2	4	3.11	1376/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1294/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1373/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	7	4	5	3.67	1278/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	1207/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	8	5	4	3.61	1221/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	5	3	3.17	1309/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	4	5	1	2	2.47	1142/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	3	0	3	3.10	1131/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1096/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	922/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	535/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 643
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	5	13	4.38	725/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	678/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	853/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	563/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	283/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	245/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	830/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	3.81	1461/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	457/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	255/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	502/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	317/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	380/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	350/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	413/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	122/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	387/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 15			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 644
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	639/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	219/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	15	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	112/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	712/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	88/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	103/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	180/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	474/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	378/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	394/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	3	0	1	1	8	3.85	776/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	483/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	344/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	154/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: Brofman, Margar
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 645
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	8	2	3.91	1194/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	572/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	741/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	517/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	685/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	654/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	636/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1123/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	665/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1029/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1162/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	961/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	619/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	543/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	667/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.14
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 646
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	5	7	3.83	1229/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	981/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	894/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	705/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	7	1	8	3.72	981/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	754/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	1122/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1337/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1117/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	971/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	790/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	887/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1011/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	703/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	976/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1032/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	897/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	387/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: LEOPOLD, KRISTI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 647
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	4	6	2	2.90	1470/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	2.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	0	6	4	5	3.20	1390/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	4	6	4	3.37	1185/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	3.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	0	1	7	6	3.47	1297/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	8	3	7	3.79	952/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	8	7	3.95	854/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	5	7	4	3.47	1292/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	674/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	6	5	1	3.06	1373/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	2	5	5	3.56	1297/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1319/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	1307/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	1	6	4	3.44	1262/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	6	2	3	3.07	1138/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1053/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	922/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	644/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 15	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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	4				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 649
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	6	5	5	3.61	1318/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1168/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	1062/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	7	4	3.72	981/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	754/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	964/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	5	7	6	0	3.06	1492/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	3.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6	3	4	3.64	1179/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	1123/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	1260/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	997/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1011/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1134/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	689/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	675/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	415/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	387/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Description	Count	Level	Count	Level	Count
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 650
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	5	5	3.67	1302/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	937/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	680/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	927/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	672/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	613/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	4.11	1376/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	961/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	991/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1022/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	736/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	1167/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	636/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	794/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	692/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	696/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	376/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.09

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 651
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	1056/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	495/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	752/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	698/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	441/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	423/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	1287/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1157/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1128/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 652
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	5	3.88	1209/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	692/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	628/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	855/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	6	1	3.19	1262/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	1018/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	761/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1274/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	4	7	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	830/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1036/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	930/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1085/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	872/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1149/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	701/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	535/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 653
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	5	4	5	3.53	1346/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1297/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	3	7	3.76	1186/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	614/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	536/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	1170/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	11	3	1	3.18	1490/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	3.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1030/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	5	1	4	3.29	1340/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1313/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1081/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1153/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	4	2	0	2	2.33	1162/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	3	8	3.88	832/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	755/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	425/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	656/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.21
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	2	B 12	Graduate 0
					Major 0

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 654
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	7	5	3	3.37	1398/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	990/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	705/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1036/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	782/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	5	5	3.32	1335/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	2	4.05	1397/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	543/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	940/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	1008/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	981/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	1103/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	3	4	6	3	3.41	959/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	947/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	833/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	741/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	553/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.62

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 655
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	3	11	3.95	1143/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	9	10	4.14	963/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	671/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	643/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	6	8	3.86	895/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	358/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	4	6	8	3.81	1146/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1353/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	1051/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	1	6	10	4.16	1100/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	1298/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	3	4	9	4.00	1013/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	953/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1108/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	699/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	869/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	876/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	387/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 655
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 656
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	725/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	587/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	412/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	855/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1101/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	187/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	13	4.44	536/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	691/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	741/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	760/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	808/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	247/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	603/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	592/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	268/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	445/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	354/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 656
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: LEOPOLD, KRISTI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 657
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	3	3	1	2.53	1492/1504	3.68	3.99	4.27	4.13	2.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	4	2	2	2.60	1478/1503	3.92	4.01	4.20	4.16	2.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	3	1	3	1	2.80	1254/1290	3.90	4.29	4.28	4.19	2.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	3	5	1	2.73	1438/1453	4.01	4.12	4.21	4.11	2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	1	5	3	3.07	1296/1421	3.67	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	1	5	3	3.13	1278/1365	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.96	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	3	2	4	3.00	1387/1485	3.85	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	960/1504	4.29	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	3.00	1379/1483	3.72	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1346/1425	4.07	4.13	4.41	4.36	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	0	7	3.92	1342/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.56	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	1	3	3.25	1307/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.20	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	1	3	3.00	1324/1416	3.88	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	919/1199	3.09	3.36	3.97	3.82	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	983/1312	3.70	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	891/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	798/1299	4.45	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	570/ 758	3.77	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.55

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: Brofman, Margar
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 658
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	6	2	3.41	1388/1504	4.24	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	1202/1503	4.45	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	937/1290	4.51	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	5	6	3.87	1129/1453	4.35	4.12	4.21	4.11	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	3	4	3.47	1131/1421	4.02	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	6	4.06	754/1365	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1230/1485	4.35	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	795/1504	4.21	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	7	3	4	3.60	1197/1483	4.10	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1229/1425	4.51	4.13	4.41	4.36	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	1242/1426	4.66	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	1136/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.20	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	2	8	2	3.25	1295/1416	4.23	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1199	3.44	3.36	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1062/1312	4.15	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1111/1303	4.43	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1033/1299	4.47	4.41	4.25	3.94	3.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 758	3.80	3.86	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 659
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	15	4.79	228/1504	4.24	3.99	4.27	4.13	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	238/1503	4.45	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	4.51	4.29	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	363/1453	4.35	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	200/1421	4.02	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	245/1365	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	270/1485	4.35	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	14	2	3.95	1436/1504	4.21	4.32	4.69	4.66	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	409/1483	4.10	3.92	4.06	3.97	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	107/1425	4.51	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1426	4.66	4.63	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	233/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	164/1416	4.23	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1110/1199	3.44	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	350/1312	4.15	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	207/1303	4.43	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1299	4.47	4.41	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	445/ 758	3.80	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 660
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	15	4.79	228/1504	4.24	3.99	4.27	4.13	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	238/1503	4.45	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	4.51	4.29	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	363/1453	4.35	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	200/1421	4.02	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	245/1365	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	270/1485	4.35	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	14	2	3.95	1436/1504	4.21	4.32	4.69	4.66	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	543/1483	4.10	3.92	4.06	3.97	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1425	4.51	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1426	4.66	4.63	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1416	4.23	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	3.44	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	350/1312	4.15	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	207/1303	4.43	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1299	4.47	4.41	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	445/ 758	3.80	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: QUINN, CAROL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 661
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	700/1504	4.24	3.99	4.27	4.13	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	248/1503	4.45	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	469/1290	4.51	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	270/1453	4.35	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	516/1421	4.02	3.98	4.00	3.91	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	187/1365	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	290/1485	4.35	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1353/1504	4.21	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	173/1483	4.10	3.92	4.06	3.97	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	255/1425	4.51	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	502/1426	4.66	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	158/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	446/1416	4.23	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	636/1199	3.44	3.36	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	350/1312	4.15	4.05	4.00	3.69	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	431/1303	4.43	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	375/1299	4.47	4.41	4.25	3.94	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	208/ 758	3.80	3.86	4.01	3.80	4.47

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 662
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	8	4	3.78	1257/1504	4.24	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	827/1503	4.45	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	937/1290	4.51	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	974/1453	4.35	4.12	4.21	4.11	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	3	6	2	2.94	1324/1421	4.02	3.98	4.00	3.91	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	754/1365	4.39	4.16	4.08	3.96	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	8	6	4.06	964/1485	4.35	3.91	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1330/1504	4.21	4.32	4.69	4.66	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	8	7	1	3.41	1271/1483	4.10	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	951/1425	4.51	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	1190/1426	4.66	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	997/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.20	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	985/1416	4.23	4.05	4.26	4.21	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	6	5	4	3.53	912/1199	3.44	3.36	3.97	3.82	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	887/1312	4.15	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	863/1303	4.43	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1044/1299	4.47	4.41	4.25	3.94	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	713/ 758	3.80	3.86	4.01	3.80	2.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 663
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	5	4	4	3.44	1380/1504	3.44	3.99	4.27	4.13	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	2	6	3.69	1239/1503	3.69	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1109/1290	3.67	4.29	4.28	4.19	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1123/1453	3.88	4.12	4.21	4.11	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	3	5	3.44	1156/1421	3.44	3.98	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1052/1365	3.69	4.16	4.08	3.96	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	1238/1485	3.63	3.91	4.16	4.13	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.32	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1332/1483	3.23	3.92	4.06	3.97	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.13	4.41	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1312/1426	4.07	4.63	4.69	4.56	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1150/1418	3.79	4.10	4.25	4.20	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	4	6	3.86	1122/1416	3.86	4.05	4.26	4.21	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	4	2	3	2	2.79	1112/1199	2.79	3.36	3.97	3.82	2.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1102/1312	3.22	4.05	4.00	3.69	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	1108/1303	3.56	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1106/1299	3.50	4.41	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	3.86	4.01	3.80	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 663
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 210A 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HALE, CHRISTOPH
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 664
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	5	8	9	3.84	1224/1504	3.84	3.99	4.27	4.26	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	10	6	3.80	1183/1503	3.80	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	8	13	4.24	800/1290	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	729/1453	4.29	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	365/1421	4.46	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	8	7	3.83	947/1365	3.83	4.16	4.08	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	8	6	6	3.61	1246/1485	3.61	3.91	4.16	4.15	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	20	4	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	7	9	4.09	804/1483	4.09	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1425	****	4.13	4.41	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1426	****	4.63	4.69	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1418	****	4.10	4.25	4.22	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1416	****	4.05	4.26	4.24	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	5	15	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	2	17	4.46	619/1303	4.46	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	102/1299	4.96	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	6	9	8	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 17		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0	Electives	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 210B 0101
 Title
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, VI
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 665
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	609/1504	4.46	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	357/1503	4.62	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	534/1290	4.48	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	10	15	4.30	718/1453	4.30	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	247/1421	4.61	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	14	12	4.27	569/1365	4.27	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	22	4.58	370/1485	4.58	3.91	4.16	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	13	11	4.22	668/1483	4.22	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	331/1425	4.81	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	201/1426	4.96	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	366/1418	4.68	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	433/1416	4.68	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	542/1199	4.19	3.36	3.97	3.95	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	483/1312	4.38	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.93	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	32	Non-major	31
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 210C 0101
 Title
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 666
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	5	6	4	2	2.76	1480/1504	2.76	3.99	4.27	4.26	2.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	6	6	2	3	2.71	1467/1503	2.71	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	6	3	1	3.50	1155/1290	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.27	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	6	5	4	3.37	1341/1453	3.37	4.12	4.21	4.20	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	7	8	3	3.52	1101/1421	3.52	3.98	4.00	3.90	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	5	7	4	3.43	1191/1365	3.43	4.16	4.08	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	5	6	3	4	2	2.60	1447/1485	2.60	3.91	4.16	4.15	2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	8	9	2	0	2.52	1500/1504	2.52	4.32	4.69	4.68	2.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	8	4	3	3.16	1355/1483	3.16	3.92	4.06	4.02	3.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	5	6	2	3	2.67	1404/1425	2.67	4.13	4.41	4.40	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	1112/1426	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	6	7	3	2	2.76	1365/1418	2.76	4.10	4.25	4.22	2.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	6	7	1	2	3	2.42	1386/1416	2.42	4.05	4.26	4.24	2.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	3	2	0	2.40	1261/1312	2.40	4.05	4.00	3.98	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	3	1	2	3.00	1195/1303	3.00	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1174/1299	3.20	4.41	4.25	4.21	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
			Required for Majors	4	Graduate
				0	Major
					1

56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENGL 241A 0101
 Title MYTHOLOGIES OF NORTH
 Instructor: SCHWEITZER, ILS
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 667
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4	3	25	4.50	549/1504	4.50	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	8	17	4.09	1002/1503	4.09	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	6	20	4.38	631/1453	4.38	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	112/1421	4.85	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	9	16	4.37	462/1365	4.37	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	8	20	4.39	602/1485	4.39	3.91	4.16	4.15	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	12	4.36	1200/1504	4.36	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	13	4.39	469/1483	4.39	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	748/1425	4.53	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	201/1426	4.97	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	11	17	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	5	20	4.45	688/1416	4.45	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	8	7	13	4.10	600/1199	4.10	3.36	3.97	3.95	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	290/1312	4.61	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	300/ 758	4.27	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	21	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241B 0101
 Title LOVE AND LYRIC TRADITI
 Instructor: QUINN, CAROL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 668
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	3	19	4.36	763/1504	4.36	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	335/1503	4.64	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	0	16	4.63	378/1290	4.63	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	331/1453	4.61	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	24	4.75	158/1421	4.75	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	20	4.54	274/1365	4.54	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	20	4.46	509/1485	4.46	3.91	4.16	4.15	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	15	11	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	149/1483	4.75	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	90/1425	4.96	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	152/1418	4.87	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	71/1416	4.96	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	3	0	0	1	4	3.38	973/1199	3.38	3.36	3.97	3.95	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	158/1312	4.81	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	138/1303	4.94	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.41	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	28	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 243A 0101
 Title DIVERSE VOICES
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 669
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	11	9	4.12	1029/1504	4.12	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	13	10	4.24	869/1503	4.24	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	10	8	4.09	902/1290	4.09	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	11	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	276/1421	4.56	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	462/1365	4.36	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	5	13	4.16	866/1485	4.16	3.91	4.16	4.15	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	657/1483	4.24	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	818/1425	4.48	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	643/1418	4.46	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	776/1416	4.38	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	2	2	5	7	3.72	835/1199	3.72	3.36	3.97	3.95	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	512/1312	4.35	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	719/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	455/1299	4.65	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 243A 0101
 Title DIVERSE VOICES
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 669
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101
 Title SOUTHERN LITERATURE
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 670
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	750/1504	4.36	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	910/1503	4.20	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	642/1290	4.40	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	15	6	4.08	957/1453	4.08	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	401/1421	4.42	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	11	8	3.96	842/1365	3.96	4.16	4.08	4.00	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	670/1485	4.33	3.91	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.32	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	700/1483	4.19	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	556/1425	4.68	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	808/1426	4.76	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	695/1418	4.42	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	583/1416	4.54	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	502/1312	4.36	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	675/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	17	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 671
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	3	2	8	18	4.03	1083/1504	4.03	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	7	10	11	3.68	1243/1503	3.68	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	3	10	5	12	3.61	1131/1290	3.61	4.29	4.28	4.27	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	4	3	2	9	12	3.73	1200/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.20	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	4	24	4.42	392/1421	4.42	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	4	5	3	8	6	3.27	1246/1365	3.27	4.16	4.08	4.00	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	8	7	15	3.97	1018/1485	3.97	3.91	4.16	4.15	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	940/1504	4.72	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	4	2	4	12	5	3.44	1258/1483	3.44	3.92	4.06	4.02	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	2	8	17	4.30	1002/1425	4.30	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	4	3	7	14	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	4	6	15	3.97	1057/1416	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.24	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	14	3	1	2	1	7	3.57	894/1199	3.57	3.36	3.97	3.95	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	6	6	12	4.08	697/1312	4.08	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	6	17	4.42	652/1303	4.42	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	3	6	15	4.23	810/1299	4.23	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	3	5	14	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 9	D 1	Under-grad	35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1	Electives	1
			P 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	23
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 250H 0101
 Title INTO TO SHAKESPEARE-HO
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 672
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	4	3.83	1229/1504	3.83	3.99	4.27	4.26	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1168/1503	3.83	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	853/1290	4.17	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	878/1453	4.17	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	261/1421	4.58	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	3.91	4.16	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	1130/1504	4.45	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	3.92	4.06	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	748/1199	3.90	3.36	3.97	3.95	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	902/1312	3.75	4.05	4.00	3.98	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101
 Title INTRO CREAT WRITG-FICTI
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 673
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	13	4.43	669/1504	4.43	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	678/1503	4.38	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	320/1453	4.62	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	524/1421	4.29	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	134/1365	4.76	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	563/1485	4.43	3.91	4.16	4.15	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	4	4.14	1353/1504	4.14	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	250/1483	4.61	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	876/1425	4.43	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	401/1426	4.93	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	402/1418	4.64	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	407/1416	4.69	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	10	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	404/1312	4.46	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	497/1303	4.62	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	810/1299	4.23	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	297/ 758	4.27	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.27

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0	Under-grad	21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0		
			P 1	Electives	4
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 674
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	14	4.57	469/1504	4.57	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	324/1503	4.65	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55	396/1453	4.55	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	9	7	3.86	895/1421	3.86	3.98	4.00	3.90	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	2	15	4.32	514/1365	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	4	6	10	4.05	969/1485	4.05	3.91	4.16	4.15	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1147/1504	4.43	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	219/1483	4.65	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	315/1425	4.82	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.05	4.26	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	7	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1312	4.88	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	227/1303	4.88	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.88	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101
 Title INTRO WRITG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 675
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	1	4	6	3	3.29	1410/1504	3.90	3.99	4.27	4.26	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	10	1	1	2.81	1451/1503	3.56	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1253/1453	4.19	4.12	4.21	4.20	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	7	4	0	2.65	1381/1421	3.29	3.98	4.00	3.90	2.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	536/1365	4.43	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	4	5	3	0	2.44	1461/1485	3.17	3.91	4.16	4.15	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.73	4.32	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	4	5	3	4	3.44	1263/1483	3.74	3.92	4.06	4.02	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	7	3	0	2.56	1407/1425	3.57	4.13	4.41	4.40	2.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	4.81	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	7	4	0	2.75	1367/1418	3.54	4.10	4.25	4.22	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	8	1	2	2.81	1349/1416	3.35	4.05	4.26	4.24	2.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1138/1199	2.75	3.36	3.97	3.95	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	716/1312	4.30	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	652/1303	4.63	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	570/1299	4.59	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	251/ 758	4.55	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201
 Title INTRO WRITG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 676
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	9	4.16	1000/1504	3.90	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1021/1503	3.56	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	352/1453	4.19	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	4	4	3.11	1290/1421	3.29	3.98	4.00	3.90	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	205/1365	4.43	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	3	8	3.89	1092/1485	3.17	3.91	4.16	4.15	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.73	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	850/1483	3.74	3.92	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	1	7	6	4.00	1165/1425	3.57	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	825/1426	4.81	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	3	6	5	3.75	1163/1418	3.54	4.10	4.25	4.22	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	3	3	5	3.38	1273/1416	3.35	4.05	4.26	4.24	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1199	2.75	3.36	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	414/1312	4.30	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.63	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	293/1299	4.59	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	84/ 758	4.55	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0	Electives	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301
 Title INTRO WRITG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 677
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	1	3	10	4.25	889/1504	3.90	3.99	4.27	4.26	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1178/1503	3.56	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	631/1453	4.19	4.12	4.21	4.20	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	660/1421	3.29	3.98	4.00	3.90	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	451/1365	4.43	4.16	4.08	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	6	3	3	3.19	1362/1485	3.17	3.91	4.16	4.15	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1274/1504	4.73	4.32	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1105/1483	3.74	3.92	4.06	4.02	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1111/1425	3.57	4.13	4.41	4.40	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	967/1426	4.81	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	955/1418	3.54	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1122/1416	3.35	4.05	4.26	4.24	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1050/1199	2.75	3.36	3.97	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	414/1312	4.30	4.05	4.00	3.98	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	540/1303	4.63	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	624/1299	4.59	4.41	4.25	4.21	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	214/ 758	4.55	3.86	4.01	3.89	4.45
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301
 Title INTRO WRITG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 677
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: KORENMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 678
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	4	0	3	9	4.06	1065/1504	4.27	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	495/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	937/1290	4.39	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	594/1453	4.41	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	383/1421	4.51	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	581/1365	4.24	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	958/1485	4.13	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	4.58	4.32	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	731/1483	4.00	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	971/1425	4.39	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	596/1426	4.87	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	838/1418	4.47	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	593/1416	4.58	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	676/1312	4.20	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	227/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	645/1299	4.40	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	379/ 758	3.61	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.07

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: BENTLEY, COLENE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 679
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	5	7	4.20	962/1504	4.27	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1110/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	642/1290	4.39	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	844/1453	4.41	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	356/1421	4.51	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	866/1365	4.24	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	591/1485	4.13	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1030/1504	4.58	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1141/1483	4.00	3.92	4.06	4.08	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	971/1425	4.39	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	860/1426	4.87	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	709/1418	4.47	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	675/1416	4.58	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	716/1312	4.20	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	6	4	3.92	975/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	922/1299	4.40	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	328/ 758	3.61	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	15
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 680
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	4.54	509/1504	4.27	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	795/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	240/1290	4.39	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	320/1453	4.41	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	241/1421	4.51	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	274/1365	4.24	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1066/1485	4.13	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1345/1504	4.58	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	782/1483	4.00	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	784/1425	4.39	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	4.87	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.47	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1416	4.58	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	404/1312	4.20	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	422/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	344/1299	4.40	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	732/ 758	3.61	3.86	4.01	4.00	2.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 681
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	3	6	3.65	1309/1504	3.65	3.99	4.27	4.27	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1297/1503	3.53	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1237/1453	3.65	4.12	4.21	4.23	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	2	5	6	3.69	1004/1421	3.69	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	960/1365	3.81	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	2	4	3	2	2.80	1419/1485	2.80	3.91	4.16	4.17	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1041/1483	3.86	3.92	4.06	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	2	6	4	3.50	1308/1425	3.50	4.13	4.41	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	1212/1426	4.38	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	3	4	4	3.31	1299/1418	3.31	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	2	6	3.56	1228/1416	3.56	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	488/1303	4.63	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	907/1299	4.06	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 682
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	14	4.63	386/1504	4.63	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	238/1503	4.74	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	681/1290	4.37	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	486/1453	4.47	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	97/1421	4.89	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	441/1365	4.39	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	290/1485	4.67	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	195/1483	4.69	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	270/1425	4.84	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	219/1418	4.79	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	209/1416	4.84	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1007/1199	3.25	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	794/1312	3.93	4.05	4.00	4.09	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	469/1303	4.64	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	621/ 758	3.38	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101
 Title BRIT LIT: NEOCLASS-ROM
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 683
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	18	4.58	442/1504	4.58	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	403/1503	4.58	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	20	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	17	4.46	517/1453	4.46	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	115/1421	4.83	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	358/1365	4.46	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	290/1485	4.67	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	1030/1504	4.61	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	250/1483	4.62	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	251/1426	4.96	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	20	4.71	331/1418	4.71	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	187/1416	4.87	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	795/1199	3.80	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	559/1312	4.30	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	17	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO
 Instructor: BENTLEY, COLENE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 684
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	1	6	18	4.58	455/1504	4.58	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	19	4.58	440/1290	4.58	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	17	4.42	563/1453	4.42	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	127/1421	4.80	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	282/1365	4.52	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	3	16	4.28	727/1485	4.28	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	13	4.52	1075/1504	4.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	12	9	4.26	624/1483	4.26	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.26

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	201/1426	4.96	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	402/1418	4.64	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	352/1416	4.74	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	271/1199	4.50	3.36	3.97	4.02	4.50

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	3	14	4.32	755/1303	4.32	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	3	5	3	7	3.78	503/ 758	3.78	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.78

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
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	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101
 Title AMERICAN LIT:1865-1945
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 685
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	1	3	12	10	4.07	1061/1504	4.07	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	10	4.10	990/1503	4.10	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	16	4.52	497/1290	4.52	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	14	4.34	668/1453	4.34	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	298/1421	4.54	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	13	10	4.18	663/1365	4.18	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	0	3	11	10	3.93	1066/1485	3.93	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	6	15	5	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	3.92	4.06	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	772/1425	4.52	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	773/1426	4.79	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	8	13	4.18	922/1418	4.18	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	10	12	4.14	961/1416	4.14	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	4	2	13	4	2	2.92	1088/1199	2.92	3.36	3.97	4.02	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	8	11	4.04	707/1312	4.04	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	6	17	4.41	675/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	2	2	6	15	4.11	890/1299	4.11	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	2	21	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 312 0101
 Title TOPICS IN FICTION
 Instructor: BENTLEY, COLENE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 686
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	6	5	9	3.95	1143/1504	3.95	3.99	4.27	4.27	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	8	6	3.77	1197/1503	3.77	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	855/1453	4.18	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	90/1421	4.91	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	8	3.86	928/1365	3.86	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	10	4.09	943/1485	4.09	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1294/1504	4.23	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	5	8	4	3.68	1161/1483	3.68	3.92	4.06	4.08	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	676/1425	4.59	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	596/1426	4.86	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	9	8	4.05	1000/1418	4.05	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	688/1416	4.45	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	3	4	3	5	3.67	860/1199	3.67	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	5	6	5	3.53	1004/1312	3.53	4.05	4.00	4.09	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	3	3	10	3.95	959/1303	3.95	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	2	1	6	8	3.84	1021/1299	3.84	4.41	4.25	4.30	3.84
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	2	0	2	6	2	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	22	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101
 Title LITERATURE OF TECHNOLO
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 687
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	2	4	5	1	2.93	1464/1504	2.93	3.99	4.27	4.27	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	5	0	0	2.07	1496/1503	2.07	4.01	4.20	4.22	2.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1420/1453	2.93	4.12	4.21	4.23	2.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	986/1421	3.71	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5	4	3.50	1153/1365	3.50	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	7	2	0	0	1.79	1483/1485	1.79	3.91	4.16	4.17	1.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	5	2	2	2	2.92	1399/1483	2.92	3.92	4.06	4.08	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	3	2	0	4	2.77	1400/1425	2.77	4.13	4.41	4.43	2.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	926/1426	4.69	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	4	4	0	2.77	1365/1418	2.77	4.10	4.25	4.26	2.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	3	1	2	2	2.46	1382/1416	2.46	4.05	4.26	4.27	2.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1129/1199	2.64	3.36	3.97	4.02	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1093/1312	3.25	4.05	4.00	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1020/1303	3.83	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	610/ 758	3.42	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 688
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	4	11	4.73	284/1504	4.73	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	74/1503	4.93	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	407/1453	4.54	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	1	6	3.73	976/1421	3.73	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	6	1	4	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	240/1485	4.71	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.32	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	506/1483	4.36	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	456/1425	4.73	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1418	4.73	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.05	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 348 0101
 Title LITERATURE AND CULTURE
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 689
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	6	4.45	624/1504	4.45	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	572/1503	4.45	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	947/1453	4.10	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	176/1421	4.73	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	842/1485	4.18	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1261/1504	4.27	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1483	4.38	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1082/1425	4.18	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	878/1426	4.73	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	643/1418	4.45	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	583/1416	4.55	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	845/1199	3.70	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.90	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	518/ 758	3.71	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 350 0101
 Title MAJ BRIT & AMER WRITER
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 690
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	146/1504	4.88	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	335/1503	4.65	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	240/1290	4.76	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	250/1453	4.69	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	119/1421	4.82	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	282/1365	4.53	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	914/1485	4.13	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	795/1504	4.82	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	67/1483	4.93	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	510/1425	4.71	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	178/1418	4.82	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	15	4.65	472/1416	4.65	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	196/1312	4.75	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	413/1303	4.71	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	97/ 758	4.77	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.77
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ENGL 350 0101
 Title MAJ BRIT & AMER WRITER
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 690
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101
 Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 691
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	2	1	4	23	4.60	416/1504	4.60	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	9	15	4.24	859/1503	4.24	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	4	19	4.34	701/1290	4.34	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	855/1453	4.18	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	25	4.75	158/1421	4.75	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1365	****	4.16	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	3	19	4.31	693/1485	4.31	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	242/1483	4.63	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	25	4.79	348/1425	4.79	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	26	4.79	755/1426	4.79	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	7	20	4.55	514/1418	4.55	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	26	4.72	366/1416	4.72	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	5	5	3	7	3.48	932/1199	3.48	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	221/1312	4.71	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	551/1303	4.52	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	696/1299	4.38	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	19	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 364 0101
 Title: PERSP ON WOMEN IN LIT
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 692
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	12	4.63	396/1504	4.63	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	250/1290	4.75	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	123/1421	4.81	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	211/1365	4.63	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	550/1485	4.44	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.94	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	543/1483	4.33	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	354/1418	4.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	138/1303	4.94	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.41	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	12	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI
 Instructor: Oliver, Laura
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 693
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	5	4.07	1061/1504	4.07	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	1014/1503	4.07	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	957/1453	4.08	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	705/1421	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	346/1365	4.47	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1257/1485	3.57	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1121/1504	4.47	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	804/1483	4.08	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	618/1425	4.64	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1418	4.90	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	485/1416	4.64	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 694
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	2	1	0	2.40	1497/1504	2.40	3.99	4.27	4.27	2.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1493/1503	2.20	4.01	4.20	4.22	2.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1437/1453	2.75	4.12	4.21	4.23	2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	1407/1421	2.20	3.98	4.00	4.01	2.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1485	****	3.91	4.16	4.17	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	1499/1504	2.80	4.32	4.69	4.65	2.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1423/1483	2.75	3.92	4.06	4.08	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	1.40	1421/1425	1.40	4.13	4.41	4.43	1.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1378/1426	3.60	4.63	4.69	4.71	3.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	1415/1418	1.80	4.10	4.25	4.26	1.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1401/1416	2.00	4.05	4.26	4.27	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1190/1199	1.50	3.36	3.97	4.02	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1261/1312	2.40	4.05	4.00	4.09	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1227/1299	2.80	4.41	4.25	4.30	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	752/ 758	2.00	3.86	4.01	4.00	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 694
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	3	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101
 Title FEATURE WRITING
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 695
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	6	10	4.44	639/1504	4.44	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	547/1453	4.44	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	4	1	6	3.31	1217/1421	3.31	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	129/1365	4.78	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	3	6	4	3.44	1300/1485	3.44	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1022/1504	4.61	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	195/1483	4.69	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	282/1416	4.79	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	189/1312	4.77	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	157/1303	4.92	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	162/1299	4.92	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	6	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 383 0101
 Title SCIENCE WRITING
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 696
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	1	7	5	4.31	826/1504	4.31	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	946/1503	4.15	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	633/1421	4.15	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	199/1365	4.64	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	9	1	3.79	1158/1485	3.79	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	8	0	3.50	1480/1504	3.50	4.32	4.69	4.65	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	1085/1416	3.93	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1018/1199	3.20	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	663/1312	4.14	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	701/1303	4.38	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	4.63	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 386 0101
 Title ADULT LITERACY TUTORIN
 Instructor: MCKUSICK, JAMES
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 697
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	2	1	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	3.99	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1207/1503	3.75	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.12	4.21	4.23	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	290/1485	4.67	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.10	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.41	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 56	4.67	4.67	4.23	4.13	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.77	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	42/ 47	3.33	3.33	4.29	4.14	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101
 Title WEB CONTENT DEVELOPMEN
 Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 698
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4.67	357/1504	4.67	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	479/1421	4.33	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.16	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	290/1485	4.67	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.36	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.41	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 699
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	2	1	5	1	2	3.00	1453/1504	3.88	3.99	4.27	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1438/1503	4.05	4.01	4.20	4.22	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1261/1290	3.71	4.29	4.28	4.31	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1427/1453	4.03	4.12	4.21	4.23	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	2.91	1337/1421	3.55	3.98	4.00	4.01	2.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	3	1	3.00	1296/1365	4.19	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	1387/1485	3.83	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1242/1504	4.55	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	4	3	3	0	2.90	1402/1483	3.85	3.92	4.06	4.08	2.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1320/1425	3.94	4.13	4.41	4.43	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1306/1426	4.48	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	5	0	3.33	1295/1418	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1324/1416	3.80	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.31	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1247/1312	3.81	4.05	4.00	4.09	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1182/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1223/1299	4.10	4.41	4.25	4.30	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	746/ 758	3.56	3.86	4.01	4.00	2.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 699
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 700
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	11	4.32	813/1504	3.88	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	707/1503	4.05	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1290	3.71	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	810/1453	4.03	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	3	7	3	3.41	1168/1421	3.55	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	333/1365	4.19	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	866/1485	3.83	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1006/1504	4.55	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	493/1483	3.85	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	1029/1425	3.94	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	1217/1426	4.48	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	939/1418	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	11	4.05	1011/1416	3.80	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	3	2	5	2	3.31	997/1199	3.31	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	0	10	4.29	572/1312	3.81	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	0	11	4.50	563/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	723/1299	4.10	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	561/ 758	3.56	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0301
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 701
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	10	4.35	763/1504	3.88	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	541/1503	4.05	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	344/1290	3.71	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	374/1453	4.03	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	305/1421	3.55	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	108/1365	4.19	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	964/1485	3.83	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1274/1504	4.55	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	10	5	4.12	782/1483	3.85	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	951/1425	3.94	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	549/1426	4.48	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	402/1418	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	603/1416	3.80	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	3.31	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	845/1312	3.81	4.05	4.00	4.09	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	719/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	570/1299	4.10	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	1	6	0	3.50	580/ 758	3.56	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	4	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	1						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 702
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1229/1504	3.88	3.99	4.27	4.27	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	587/1503	4.05	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	3.71	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	547/1453	4.03	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	2	4	2	6	3.35	1198/1421	3.55	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	333/1365	4.19	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	926/1485	3.83	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.55	4.32	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	850/1483	3.85	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1272/1425	3.94	4.13	4.41	4.43	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	1104/1426	4.48	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1123/1418	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1213/1416	3.80	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	3.31	3.36	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	290/1312	3.81	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	497/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	415/1299	4.10	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	77/ 758	3.56	3.86	4.01	4.00	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 703
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	1	3	2	2	2.50	1493/1504	3.48	3.99	4.27	4.27	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	5	1	3	2.86	1445/1503	3.57	4.01	4.20	4.22	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1290	4.13	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	2	4	3.14	1387/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.23	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	1372/1421	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.01	2.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	5	3.50	1153/1365	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	2	4	3	3.14	1370/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1207/1504	3.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1415/1483	3.29	3.92	4.06	4.08	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	2	4	2	2.93	1382/1425	3.60	4.13	4.41	4.43	2.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1339/1426	4.12	4.63	4.69	4.71	3.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	5	2	1	2.64	1382/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	2.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	1	2	2	2	2.36	1391/1416	3.33	4.05	4.26	4.27	2.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	1	4	1	1	2.60	1133/1199	3.30	3.36	3.97	4.02	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1149/1312	3.82	4.05	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1121/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	4	0	5	3.80	1038/1299	4.05	4.41	4.25	4.30	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	4.16	3.86	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 11
				? 0	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 704
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	7	5	3	2.92	1468/1504	3.48	3.99	4.27	4.27	2.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	9	5	4	3.13	1403/1503	3.57	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1290	4.13	4.29	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	7	7	4	3.41	1333/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.23	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	4	4	6	3.00	1305/1421	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	5	6	6	3.39	1204/1365	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	5	4	4	7	2	2.86	1414/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.17	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	13	2	5	2	1	1.96	1504/1504	3.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	1.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	7	4	6	0	2.57	1441/1483	3.29	3.92	4.06	4.08	2.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	11	5	3	3.13	1362/1425	3.60	4.13	4.41	4.43	3.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	0	5	7	9	3.79	1362/1426	4.12	4.63	4.69	4.71	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	6	9	3	3.25	1307/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	5	7	3	2.92	1342/1416	3.33	4.05	4.26	4.27	2.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	4	5	0	3	3	2.73	1117/1199	3.30	3.36	3.97	4.02	2.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1102/1312	3.82	4.05	4.00	4.09	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	910/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1126/1299	4.05	4.41	4.25	4.30	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	343/ 758	4.16	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 705
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	5	1	2.65	1488/1504	3.48	3.99	4.27	4.27	2.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	6	7	3	0	2.45	1488/1503	3.57	4.01	4.20	4.22	2.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1236/1290	4.13	4.29	4.28	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	2	4	2.90	1425/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.23	2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	4	6	2	3.00	1305/1421	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	3.00	1296/1365	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	6	1	4	2.80	1419/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.17	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	6	10	3	1	0	1.95	1504/1504	3.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	1.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	5	7	4	2	0	2.17	1463/1483	3.29	3.92	4.06	4.08	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	6	7	4	0	2.60	1407/1425	3.60	4.13	4.41	4.43	2.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	11	6	2	3.45	1385/1426	4.12	4.63	4.69	4.71	3.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	9	5	1	3.05	1327/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	4	4	3	1	2.25	1396/1416	3.33	4.05	4.26	4.27	2.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	2	6	4	0	0	2.17	1175/1199	3.30	3.36	3.97	4.02	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	1087/1312	3.82	4.05	4.00	4.09	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1147/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1214/1299	4.05	4.41	4.25	4.30	2.91
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	0	3	4	1	3.20	659/ 758	4.16	3.86	4.01	4.00	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.67	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	3.33	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 705
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 706
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	788/1504	3.48	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	751/1503	3.57	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.13	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	501/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	1	4	5	3.40	1175/1421	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	274/1365	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	670/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	916/1504	3.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	635/1483	3.29	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	492/1425	3.60	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	4.12	4.63	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	158/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	904/1416	3.33	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	412/1199	3.30	3.36	3.97	4.02	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	465/1312	3.82	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.05	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	4.16	3.86	4.01	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	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 707
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1038/1504	3.48	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	827/1503	3.57	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	832/1290	4.13	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	935/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	7	2	3	3.00	1305/1421	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	672/1365	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	866/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	778/1504	3.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	762/1483	3.29	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	688/1425	3.60	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	690/1426	4.12	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	552/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	791/1416	3.33	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	766/1199	3.30	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	3.82	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.05	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.16	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 708
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	3.50	1353/1504	3.48	3.99	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1304/1503	3.57	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1282/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.23	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1113/1421	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1387/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1501/1504	3.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	2.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.29	3.92	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1367/1425	3.60	4.13	4.41	4.43	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1406/1426	4.12	4.63	4.69	4.71	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.33	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.30	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 709
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	3	4.33	788/1504	3.48	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	587/1503	3.57	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	507/1290	4.13	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	385/1453	3.73	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	879/1421	3.22	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	260/1365	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1221/1504	3.52	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	751/1483	3.29	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1036/1425	3.60	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.12	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	578/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	871/1416	3.33	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	394/1199	3.30	3.36	3.97	4.02	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	651/1312	3.82	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.05	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.16	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 710
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4.40	700/1504	4.41	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1503	4.44	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.43	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	3.89	3.98	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	782/1365	4.36	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	830/1485	4.17	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1173/1504	4.06	4.32	4.69	4.65	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.20	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.44	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1197/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	4.17	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1145/1416	4.11	4.05	4.26	4.27	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.00	3.36	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.41	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	3.86	4.01	4.00	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 711
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	5	4.43	669/1504	4.41	3.99	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	816/1503	4.44	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1453	4.43	4.12	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1073/1421	3.89	3.98	4.00	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1365	4.36	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	890/1485	4.17	3.91	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1471/1504	4.06	4.32	4.69	4.65	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	457/1483	4.20	3.92	4.06	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1015/1425	4.44	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1073/1426	4.49	4.63	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	947/1418	4.17	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	727/1416	4.11	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	860/1199	4.00	3.36	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1299	4.33	4.41	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.67	3.86	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 405 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN LITERARY HI
 Instructor: IRMSCHER, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 712
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	396/1504	4.63	3.99	4.27	4.33	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.12	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1421	4.75	3.98	4.00	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.16	4.08	4.09	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	625/1485	4.38	3.91	4.16	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.32	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	173/1483	4.71	3.92	4.06	4.11	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.13	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	488/1418	4.57	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.86	4.05	4.26	4.26	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.36	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1303	4.86	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.41	4.25	4.38	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.86	4.01	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.88	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.75	4.35	4.63	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	26/ 67	4.88	4.56	4.34	4.34	4.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	42/ 76	4.63	4.56	4.44	4.51	4.63
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	43/ 73	4.13	3.90	4.17	4.29	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 713
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	7	4.21	940/1504	4.21	3.99	4.27	4.33	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1183/1503	3.80	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.32	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.12	4.21	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	247/1421	4.60	3.98	4.00	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	569/1365	4.27	4.16	4.08	4.09	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	3.91	4.16	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	1314/1504	4.20	4.32	4.69	4.73	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	961/1483	3.93	3.92	4.06	4.11	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1245/1425	3.80	4.13	4.41	4.38	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1050/1426	4.60	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1008/1416	4.07	4.05	4.26	4.26	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.36	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	502/1312	4.36	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	619/1303	4.45	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	474/1299	4.64	4.41	4.25	4.38	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	638/ 758	3.30	3.86	4.01	4.17	3.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	7	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 448A 0101
 Title LITERATURE & EMPIRE
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 714
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	4	4	4.50	549/1504	4.50	3.99	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1263/1503	3.63	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.12	4.21	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1421	4.75	3.98	4.00	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.16	4.08	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	761/1485	4.25	3.91	4.16	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.32	4.69	4.73	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1020/1483	3.88	3.92	4.06	4.11	3.88

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.13	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1163/1418	3.75	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.05	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.36	3.97	4.05	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	493/1312	4.38	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.41	4.25	4.38	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	3.86	4.01	4.17	3.00

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	43/ 76	4.75	4.88	4.61	4.63	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	45/ 70	4.50	4.75	4.35	4.63	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	46/ 67	4.25	4.56	4.34	4.34	4.25
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	46/ 76	4.50	4.56	4.44	4.51	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	58/ 73	3.67	3.90	4.17	4.29	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 448B 0101
 Title LITERATURE, VALUES, AN
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 715
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1219/1504	3.86	3.99	4.27	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1008/1503	4.07	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	1	10	4.21	821/1453	4.21	4.12	4.21	4.22	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	633/1421	4.15	3.98	4.00	4.02	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	603/1365	4.23	4.16	4.08	4.09	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1272/1485	3.54	3.91	4.16	4.14	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1022/1504	4.62	4.32	4.69	4.73	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1188/1483	3.63	3.92	4.06	4.11	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1301/1425	3.55	4.13	4.41	4.38	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	1008/1426	4.64	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1316/1418	3.18	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	0	5	3.64	1207/1416	3.64	4.05	4.26	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	600/1199	4.10	3.36	3.97	4.05	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1076/1303	3.67	4.39	4.24	4.34	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1025/1299	3.83	4.41	4.25	4.38	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	3.86	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 451 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN MAJOR WRITE
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 716
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.99	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	631/1453	4.38	4.12	4.21	4.22	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.98	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.16	4.08	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	3.91	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1368/1504	4.13	4.32	4.69	4.73	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	5.00	3.92	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1245/1425	3.80	4.13	4.41	4.38	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.05	4.26	4.26	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.36	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.41	4.25	4.38	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	3.86	4.01	4.17	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.88	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.75	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.56	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.56	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.90	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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