Course Section: HIST 100 0101 University of Maryla Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION Baltimore County Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 1003
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	41					
Questionnaires:	29	S	tudent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

								_	ncies				ructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	375/1669	4.39	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.68
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	41/1666	4.44	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.96
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	242/1421	4.43	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.79
	_	ations reflect		_	1	0	0	2	1	7	18	4.46	554/1617	4.11	4.29	4.15	3.99	4.46
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	316/1555	4.28	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.54
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	8	12	4.08	850/1543	3.85	4.15	4.06	3.86	4.08
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	156/1647	4.43	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.82
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	285/1668	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.96
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	188/1605	4.32	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.73
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	151/1514	4.77	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.93
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	409/1551	4.90	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.93
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	289/1503	4.59	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.74
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	225/1506	4.69	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.85
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	2	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	305/1311	4.24	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.44
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	14	0	3	1	1	4	6	3.60	1117/1490	3.82	3.97	4.05	3.85	3.60
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	14	0	2	0	3	2	8	3.93	1085/1502	4.13	4.36	4.26	4.06	3.93
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	14	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	1098/1489	4.31	4.52	4.29	4.07	3.93
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		14	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1006	3.55	3.83	4.00	3.81	****
		Field	Work															
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand yo	ur evalı	uation criteria	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ty	pe			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27 28-55	2 3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 14 B 9		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-1.99	1 5	в 9 С 1		Cox	nera:	1				3	Under-q	rad o	9	Non	-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-2.99	5 5	D 0		Gel	iera.	L				3	onder-g	rau Z	J	NOI1-	-ma Jor	25
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49	5 1	Б 0 F 0		- רים	ectiv	TO C				1	#### - 1	Moora +	horo -	x0 xc+	ono	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	Т	P 0		Е⊥€	=CLT,	/es				_	respons				_	ìII
				I 0		O+1	ner				1	.5	respons	es to D	e sign	ııııcaı	16	
				? 3		OCI	151				1							
				; 3														

Course Section: HIST 100 0201

Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION

HUDGINS, NICOLE Instructor:

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 32

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1004 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer			_		ructor		_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	13	12	4.13	1077/1669	4.39	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	17	14	4.41	691/1666	4.44	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	18		670/1421		4.42	4.24	4.11	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	7	10	10		1011/1617			4.15	3.99	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	12	14	4.22	592/1555		4.26	4.00	3.92	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	15	8		1138/1543		4.15	4.06	3.86	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	13 27	15 5		790/1647		4.33	4.12 4.67	4.06 4.62	4.31 4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	18	9		1444/1668 701/1605		4.68 4.22	4.67		4.16
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	4	10	9	4.24	701/1003	4.32	4.22	4.07	3.90	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	505/1514	4.77	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	512/1551	4.90	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	399/1503	4.59	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	509/1506	4.69	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	7	10	12	4.07	557/1311	4.24	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.07
_,														
Discussion	1.0	0	_	1	_	0	_	2 01	056/1400	2 00	2 07	4 05	2 05	2 01
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0 0	0	1	6 1	8	6 13	3.91	956/1490		3.97	4.05	3.85 4.06	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10 10	0	0	0	1	8 6	15	4.55	595/1502 564/1489		4.36 4.52	4.26 4.29	4.06	4.55 4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	2	8	5	2		804/1409		3.83		3.81	
i. Were special teciniques successiai	10	3	O	2	O	5		3.11	001/1000	3.33	3.03	1.00	3.01	3.11
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
<u>.</u>														
Seminar	2.1	0	•	•	0	_	-	F 00	****	als als als als	4 00	1 26	4 10	als als als als
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	***	4.80	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31 31	0	0	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 92 ****/ 105	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98		3.75 3.00	4.20 3.95	3.94 3.90	****
5. Were Criteria for grading made Clear	31	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 90		3.00	3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
Self Paced				_			_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									
				_					_					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	1	А	11	Required for Majors	18	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Ω						

Course Section: HIST 100 0301 University of Maryland Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION Baltimore County Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 1005
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	35				
Questionnaires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equei		s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	vou gain n	new insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	633/1669	4.39	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.48
	1 0	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	4	7	- 8		1037/1666		4.33	4.19	4.11	4.10
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	0	8	12	4.48	594/1421		4.42	4.24	4.11	4.48
		uations reflect		-	2	5	0	1	4	4			1140/1617		4.29	4.15	3.99	3.93
				what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	5	10	4.00	773/1555		4.26	4.00	3.92	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	6	3	7	5		1253/1543		4.15	4.06	3.86	3.52
		ng system clearl			0	0	0	0	6	4	11				4.33	4.12	4.06	4.24
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668		4.68	4.67	4.62	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	800/1605		4.22		3.96	4.16
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	e the instr	cuctor's lecture	s well j	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	663/1514	4.77	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.62
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.90
3. Was	lecture ma	aterial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	604/1503	4.59	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.48
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	623/1506	4.69	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.52
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	1	3	3	4	9	3.85	731/1311	4.24	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.85
		Discus																
				what you learned	14		1	1	2	2	1		1305/1490		3.97		3.85	3.14
				d to participate	14	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	859/1502		4.36	4.26	4.06	4.29
		_		d open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1		4.29	903/1489		4.52	4.29	4.07	4.29
4. Were	e special t	echniques succe	ssful		14	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.55	3.83	4.00	3.81	****
				Freq		. Dia	+ wib	.+	_									
				rrequ	lency	DIS	CLID	JL I OI	11									
Credita	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	guire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s 1		Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 8			-			_						<b>J</b> -		
56-83		2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Gei	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad 2	:1	Non-	major	18
84-150		3.00-3.49	3	D 0									3				-	
Grad.		3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ŗh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot1	her					2	-		3			
				? 1														

Course Section: HIST 100 0401 WESTERN CIVILIZATION Baltimore County MCDONOUGH, SUSA Instructor:

Title

University of Maryland Page 1006 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	43	
Questionnaires:	29	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncie	S			ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	360/1669	4.39	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.69
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	2	24	4.79	206/1666	4.44	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.79
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	229/1421	4.43	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.79
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	21	4.61	394/1617	4.11	4.29	4.15	3.99	4.61
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	132/1555	4.28	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.82
6. Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	226/1543	3.85	4.15	4.06	3.86	4.69
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	1	0	2	25	4.82	156/1647	4.43	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.82
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	10	18	4.64	1087/1668	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.64
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	298/1605	4.32	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.60
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	76/1514	4.77	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.97
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1551	4.90	4.90	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1503	4.59	4.50	4.24	4.17	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	66/1506	4.69	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.97
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	93/1311	4.24	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	162/1490	3.82	3.97	4.05	3.85	4.88
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	0	4	3	17	4.54	595/1502	4.13	4.36	4.26	4.06	4.54
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	434/1489	4.31	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		5	4	1	3	1	7	8	3.90	607/1006	3.55	3.83	4.00	3.81	3.90
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backg	round information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	 0	A 8							 a 1		Cwaduat	- 	 0			2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 13		кес	quire	eu I	OT IM	ajor	5 I	.5	Graduat	E	U	Majo	ıΤ	۷
28-55 56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	B 13		Gor	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad ?	29	Non	-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	2	D 0		Gei	ici d.	L				7	onder -g	rau 2		NOII-	iia jui	۷ /
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		₽1.	ectiv	700				1	#### - 1	Maana +	hara a	re not	- anous	·h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	Τ.	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD				-	respons				_	11
				I O		O+1	ner					5	T CPFOILE	נט נט ג	c argii	ıııcaı		
				? 2		OLI	101					J						
				. 4														

Course Section: HIST 100 0501 University of Maryland

WESTERN CIVILIZATION Baltimore Cou

Title WESTERN CIVILIZA'
Instructor: HUDGINS, NICOLE

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 27

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1007 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	2	0	0	0	_	1.0	_	4 00	1152/1660	4 20	4 40	4 00	4 00	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	7	10	7		1173/1669			4.23	4.02	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	-	1	4	12	7		1071/1666	4.44	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	5	9	1		1100/1421	4.43	4.42	4.24	4.11	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1 1	0	0 1	7 5	10 9	6 7		1098/1617	4.11	4.29	4.15	3.99 3.92	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	5 6	11	4		773/1555 1195/1543	4.28	4.26 4.15	4.00 4.06	3.94	4.00 3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	4	10	_		1195/1543	4.43	4.13	4.12	4.06	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	13			1321/1668	4.53	4.68	4.12	4.62	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	6	8	4		1108/1605		4.22	4.07	3.96	3.89
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	U	U	U	U	O	-	3.05	1100/1003	1.52	1.22	1.07	3.90	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	775/1514	4.77	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	20	4.71	973/1551	4.90	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	11	7	4.14	987/1503	4.59	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	757/1506	4.69	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	6	9	7	3.96	643/1311	4.24	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	684/1490	3.82	3.97	4.05	3.85	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	975/1502	4.13	4.36	4.26	4.06	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	980/1489	4.31	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	841/1006	3.55	3.83	4.00	3.81	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.17 ****														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
1 Shore shough proceed for all the beautiful		J	3	3	J	_	J	1.00	, 20			1.51		
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected Gra	des Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A б	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P 0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I 0	Other	1	-		_	

? 0

Course Section: HIST 100 0601 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Instructor: Enrollment: 108 Questionnaires: 58

Fall 2006 GRUBB, JAMES S

Page 1008 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights, skills	from this course	1	0	0	1	8	18	30	4.35	793/1669	4.39	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.35
		ctor make clear the		1	0	0	0	11	17	29	4.32	801/1666	4.44	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.32
		uestions reflect th		1	0	1	3	7	15	31	4.26	806/1421	4.43	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.26
	_	uations reflect the		2	7	4	5	10	14	16	3.67	1295/1617	4.11	4.29	4.15	3.99	3.67
			to what you learned	1	4	0	2	10	22	19	4.09	715/1555	4.28	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.09
6. Did	written as:	signments contribu	te to what you learned	2	2	5	6	17	14	12	3.41	1303/1543	3.85	4.15	4.06	3.86	3.41
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly ex	xplained	1	0	0	2	6	13	36	4.46	566/1647	4.43	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.46
8. How	many times	was class cancelle	ed	1	1	0	0	2	49	5	4.05	1503/1668	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.05
9. How	would you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	2	24	15	4.32	617/1605	4.32	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.32
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	50	4.86	274/1514	4.77	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.86
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem interest	ed in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	54	4.93	409/1551	4.90	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.93
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presented a	nd explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	16	36	4.55	510/1503	4.59	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.55
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute to w	nat you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	46	4.77	340/1506	4.69	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.77
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enhan	ce your understanding	3	1	0	0	14	13	27	4.24	451/1311	4.24	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.24
		-1															
1 54	aloga diga	Discussion	n to what you learned	17	0	10	5	6	9	11	2 1 5	1305/1490	3.82	3.97	4.05	3.85	3.15
			raged to participate	17	0	4	10	6	9	12		1349/1502	4.13	4.36	4.05	4.06	3.13
			r and open discussion	17	0	4	2	4	8			1020/1489	4.31	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.07
		echniques successf		16	33	2	2	1	1	3		****/1006		3.83	4.00	3.81	****
	_	-															
0 17	to the second second second	Seminar	1 1	<b>-</b> 4	1	1	0	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 07		4 00	4 26	4 10	****
2. was	tne instru	ctor avallable for	individual attention	54	1	1	0	0	2	U	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.19	* * * *
		Field Worl	ς														
2. Did	you clearly	y understand your (	evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
		Self Pac	2d														
3. Were	your cont	acts with the inst		57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
			Frequ		- D												
			rrequ	lency	DIS	CLID	ucio	11									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 14		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	в 14			_			-								
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 0	C 6		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 5	8	Non-	-major	58
84-150	) 3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0														
Grad.	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					h	
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot	her				1	2						
			3 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1009

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course Section: HIST 100H 0101

WESTERN CIV--HONORS

BIRKENMEIER, JO

Title

Instructor:

			Question		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			Genera	 1															
1 г	oid vou	gain n	new insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.50
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666		4.33	4.19	4.11	5.00
			mestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.11	5.00
		-	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.29	4.15	3.99	5.00
					what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.00
					o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1260/1543	3.50	4.15	4.06	3.86	3.50
7. V	Was the	gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.50
8. I	How man	y times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. I	How wou	ld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.50
			Lectur	e															
			prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514		4.66	4.39	4.32	5.00		
			n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.55	5.00		
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	556/1503		4.50	4.24	4.17	4.50	
			you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1506		4.53	4.26	4.17	5.00		
5. I	Did aud	iovisua	al techniques en	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.15	3.85	3.68	5.00	
			Discus	sion															
					what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1			1431/1490	2.50	3.97	4.05	3.85	2.50
					d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1502		4.36	4.26	4.06	5.00
3. I	Did the	instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.07	5.00
			Semina																
2. V	Was the	instru	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 97	4.00	4.80	4.36	4.19	4.00
					Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Cred	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-	 -27	0	A 1		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0		
	-55	В 1						J						3 -					
56-	-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	2
84-	-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
					I 0		Otl	her					1						
					? 0														

Course Section: HIST 101 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY

Enrollment: 34 Ouestionnaires: 24

# Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1010

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 4 18 4.74 293/1669 4.38 4.42 4.23 4.02 4.74 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 6 16 4.65 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 5 17 4.70 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 0 0 2 6 12 4.50 372/1666 4.39 4.33 4.19 4.11 4.65 356/1421 4.54 4.42 4.24 4.11 4.70 496/1617 4.13 4.29 4.15 3.99 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 7 15 4.61 262/1555 4.33 4.26 4.00 3.92 4.61 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 0 1 9 11 4.48 427/1543 3.98 4.15 4.06 3.86 4.48 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 7 14 4.52 458/1647 4.25 4.33 4.12 4.06 4.52 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 5 18 4.78 926/1668 4.52 4.68 4.67 4.62 4.78 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 8 10 4.56 335/1605 4.29 4.22 4.07 3.96 4.56 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 3 19 4.86 257/1514 4.68 4.66 4.39 4.32 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 1 21 4.95 256/1551 4.89 4.90 4.66 4.55 4.95 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 3 19 4.86 163/1503 4.65 4.50 4.24 4.17 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 21 4.95 82/1506 4.71 4.53 4.26 4.17 4.95 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 0 0 0 3 16 4.84 101/1311 3.66 4.15 3.85 3.68 4.84 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 0 1 5 7 4.21 726/1490 3.92 3.97 4.05 3.85 4.21 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 1 0 2 4 7 4.14 950/1502 4.06 4.36 4.26 4.06 4.14 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 903/1489 4.26 4.52 4.29 4.07 4.29 4. Were special techniques successful 9 12 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 \*\*\*\*/1006 3.63 3.83 4.00 3.81 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	Α	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	1						

Course Section: HIST 101 0201 University of Maryland Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: JOHNSON, MICHAE

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 20

Page 1011 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

								Fre	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																	
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,skil		this cou	rse	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1288/1669	4.38	4.42	4.23	4.02	3.90
_	-	ctor make clear				1	0	1	4	2	3	9		1320/1666	4.39	4.33	4.19		3.79
		uestions reflect				0	0	1	2	2	2	13	4.20	863/1421	4.54	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.20
	_	uations reflect	-			1	2	3	1	3	4	6		1364/1617	4.13	4.29	4.15	3.99	3.53
		eadings contribu	_	_		1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	243/1555	4.33	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.63
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	bute to	what you	learned	1	0	0	3	3	7	6	3.84	1068/1543	3.98	4.15	4.06	3.86	3.84
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly	explair	ned		1	0	2	3	6	3	5	3.32	1484/1647	4.25	4.33	4.12	4.06	3.32
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	lled			1	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	4.52	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.32
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teach	ing effec	tiveness	5	0	0	1	5	8	1	3.60	1312/1605	4.29	4.22	4.07	3.96	3.60
		Lecture																	
1. Were t	the instr		1	0	0	1	6	3	9	4.05	1185/1514	4.68	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.05			
2. Did th	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	825/1551	4.89	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.79
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented	and exp	plained c	learly	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	914/1503	4.65	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.21
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to	what yo	ou learne	d	1	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	988/1506	4.71	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.16
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	ance you	ır unders	tanding	1	2	4	5	3	2	3	2.71	1205/1311	3.66	4.15	3.85	3.68	2.71
		Discuss	ion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	te to wh	nat you l	earned	10	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1003/1490	3.92	3.97	4.05	3.85	3.80
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively enc	ouraged	to parti	cipate	10	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1237/1502	4.06	4.36	4.26	4.06	3.70
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air and	open dis	cussion	10	0	0	3	0	2	5	3.90	1125/1489	4.26	4.52	4.29	4.07	3.90
4. Were s	special t	echniques succes	sful			11	1	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	717/1006	3.63	3.83	4.00	3.81	3.63
		Field W	ork																
1. Did fi	Did field experience contribute to what you learned					19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
					Freq	uency	7 Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27								 mir	ed fo	 or M	 a ior		 8	 Graduat		0	 Majo		0
28-55								1411	- Lu	O1 11	۱۰۰۰	2	0	Siaduat	_	0	1100	· <b>-</b>	O

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2		7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	=			
				2	Λ						

Course Section: HIST 101 0301 University of Maryland Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1012

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Non-major 26

Instructor: FISCHER, LAWREN Enrollment: 44

Questionnaires: 26

56-83

Grad.

84-150

2

2

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

1

1

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls from	this cour	se	1	0	0	0	0	12	13	4.52	567/1669	4.38	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.52
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goal	S	1	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	439/1666	4.39	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.60
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	the exp	pected goa	ls	1	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	380/1421	4.54	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.68
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the exp	ected goal	S	1	4	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	539/1617	4.13	4.29	4.15	3.99	4.48
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ute to w	nat you le	arned	1	0	0	3	1	11	10	4.12	687/1555	4.33	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.12
6. Did wi	ritten ass	signments contri	ibute to	what you	learned	1	3	2	1	5	8	6	3.68	1185/1543	3.98	4.15	4.06	3.86	3.68
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y explain	ned		1	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	250/1647	4.25	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.72
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled			1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	570/1668	4.52	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.92
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teach:	ing effect	iveness	5	1	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	335/1605	4.29	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.55
		Lecture	<b>e</b>																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures		2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	170/1514	4.68	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.92		
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subje	ct	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	460/1551	4.89	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.92
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	d and exp	plained cl	early	2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	335/1503	4.65	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.71
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned		3	1	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	273/1506	4.71	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.82
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enh	nance you	ır underst	anding	2	7	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	861/1311	3.66	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.65
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ute to wi	nat you le	arned	10	0	2	0	6	2	6	3.63	1107/1490	3.92	3.97	4.05	3.85	3.63
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	couraged	to partic	ipate	10	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1085/1502	4.06	4.36	4.26	4.06	3.94
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage i	fair and	open disc	ussion	10	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	883/1489	4.26	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.31
4. Were s	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion. Were special techniques successful						14	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.63	3.83	4.00	3.81	****
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	ı												
Cmodite T	Formed	Crades				Do-		~			m				Mo i or				
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								кеа	ason	.s 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	3	8		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	12											_		_			

General

Other

Electives

4

Under-grad 26

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course Section: HIST 101 0401

Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Instructor: FISCHER, LAWREN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 26

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1013 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	804/1669	4.38	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	527/1666	4.39	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	493/1421	4.54	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	6	4	11	4.00	1029/1617	4.13	4.29	4.15	3.99	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	4	14	3.96	839/1555	4.33	4.26	4.00	3.92	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	4	6	10	3.91	1006/1543	3.98	4.15	4.06	3.86	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	549/1647	4.25	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	21	2	4.04	1508/1668	4.52	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	410/1605	4.29	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	257/1514	4.68	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	460/1551	4.89	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	191/1503	4.65	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	147/1506	4.71	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	9	6	4	3.45	967/1311	3.66	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	828/1490	3.92	3.97	4.05	3.85	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	5		4.47	668/1502	4.06	4.36	4.26	4.06	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	4		4.53	666/1489	4.26	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1006	3.63	3.83	4.00	3.81	****
- 1														
Laboratory	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 (7	****/ 233	++++	++++	4 10	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.6/	^^^^/ 233	* * * * *		4.19	4.09	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	Λ	0	1	5 00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	3.79	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 98	****	3.75	3.95	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	23	Τ	U	U	Т	U	Τ	4.00	/ 90		3.00	3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
4. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	2	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 40			3.91	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
, ,,		-	,	-	-	J	_		, 33					

Course Section: HIST 101 0401

Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Instructor: FI

FISCHER, LAWREN

Enrollment: 40
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1013 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 102 0101

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: SIMPSON, BRADLE

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 27

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1014 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				eque			_		ructor		Dept			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	647/1669	4.51	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	549/1666	4.52	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	356/1421	4.58	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	3	11	7	3.96	1098/1617	4.39	4.29	4.15	3.99	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	398/1555	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	13	7	4.08	844/1543	4.38	4.15	4.06	3.86	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	926/1647	4.53	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	1017/1668	4.45	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	642/1605	4.35	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	727/1514	4.75	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1551	4.97	4.90	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	220/1503	4.75	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	340/1506	4.74	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	126/1311	4.36	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	6	5	8	3.82	998/1490	3.93	3.97	4.05	3.85	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	6	13	4.32	836/1502	3.99	4.36	4.26	4.06	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	5	16	4.59	604/1489	4.31	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	3	6	7	3	3.40	810/1006	3.88	3.83	4.00	3.81	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.19	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	3.94	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	***	3.00	3.95	3.90	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
Trem	iencs	, Die	trib	utio	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	 8	Required for Majors	13	 Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	27	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 102 0201

AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Title Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 22 Fall 2006

Page 1015 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	318/1669	4.51	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.71
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	359/1666	4.52	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.67
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	453/1421		4.42	4.24	4.11	4.62
	_	uations reflect				12	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	717/1617		4.29	4.15	3.99	4.33
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	492/1555		4.26	4.00	3.92	4.33
				what you learned	2	14	0	0	2	1	3				4.15	4.06	3.86	4.17
		g system clearl		_	1	0	0	0	2			4.57			4.33	4.12	4.06	4.57
	-	was class canc		rnea	2	0	0	0	3	16			1594/1668		4.68	4.67	4.62	3.90
				ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	8	8		373/1605		4.22	4.07		4.50
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well j	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	360/1514	4.75	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.80
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.97	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.95
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	182/1503	4.75	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.84
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	313/1506	4.74	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.79
				our understanding	3	1	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	389/1311	4.36	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.33
		Discus																
				what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	849/1490		3.97	4.05	3.85	4.00
		_	_	d to participate	15	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.99	4.36	4.26	4.06	4.00
				d open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	973/1489	4.31	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.17
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		15	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1006	3.88	3.83	4.00	3.81	****
		Labora	_															
		crease understa ded with adequa	_	f the material ground information	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 226 ****/ 233	****	****	4.20 4.19	3.98 4.09	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	assigned t			announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.04	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	ield exper	rience contribu	te to w	nat you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
		Self																
	_	_		what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
		tions make clea			21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
_		acts with the i		_	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was th	ne feedbac	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were t	there enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	ne students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ıtior	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 8								_		_				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				6	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
						01.3	la a c					4	respons	es LO I	Je SIGN	ıııcan	IL	
				I 0		Uti	her					4						

Course Section: HIST 102 0301 University of Maryland Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877 Baltimore County Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 1016
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

4

Enrollment:	43		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

I

?

0

0

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	590/1669	4.51	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	243/1666	4.52	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.58	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.86
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	156/1617	4.39	4.29	4.15	3.99	4.81
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	249/1555	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.92	4.63
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	180/1543	4.38	4.15	4.06	3.86	4.75
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	78/1647	4.53	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.94
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1382/1668	4.45	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.25
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	525/1605	4.35	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.38
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	240/1514	4.75	4.66	4.39	4.32	4.88
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.97	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.94
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	154/1503	4.75	4.50	4.24	4.17	4.88
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	115/1506	4.74	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.94
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	142/1311	4.36	4.15	3.85	3.68	4.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	405/1490	3.93	3.97	4.05	3.85	4.57
				d to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	907/1502	3.99	4.36	4.26	4.06	4.21
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	478/1489	4.31	4.52	4.29	4.07	4.71
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	333/1006	3.88	3.83	4.00	3.81	4.36
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
G	7	G GD3		Towns at ad Consider				Das		_			m				M = = = = = =	
Credits E	ar.uea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				кеа	ason	.5 			Ту:	 be			Majors	; 
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5				_					_	_	_			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	T				4	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		-						_						_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

Course Section: HIST 102 0401

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: BECKER, MARTIN

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1017 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	781/1669	4.51	4.42	4.23	4.02	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	993/1666	4.52	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	894/1421	4.58	4.42	4.24	4.11	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	539/1617	4.39	4.29	4.15	3.99	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	8	5	3	3.25	1359/1555	4.16	4.26	4.00	3.92	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	390/1543	4.38	4.15	4.06	3.86	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	651/1647	4.53	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.45	4.68	4.67	4.62	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	713/1605	4.35	4.22	4.07	3.96	4.24
Lecture	_					_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3		4.75	441/1514	4.75		4.39	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1551	4.97	4.90	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2			4.50	556/1503	4.75		4.24	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	680/1506	4.74	4.53	4.26	4.17	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	904/1311	4.36	4.15	3.85	3.68	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	2	4	3	3 33	1233/1490	3.93	3.97	4.05	3.85	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	2	1	5		1334/1502	3.99	4.36	4.05	4.06	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	4	3			1191/1489	4.31	4.52			3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	0	U		U	4	3	-1	3.75	1191/1409	4.31	4.52	4.23	4.07	3.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
						_	-		****/ 52	****	****			****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39			4.39	4.30	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.23	4.22	****
J. Here energy proceeds for all the students	エノ	U	U	J	U	_	U	1.00	, 29			1.51	1.22	

Course Section: HIST 102 0401

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: BECKER, MARTIN

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1017 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 103 0101 University of Maryland EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1018

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA

Enrollment: 80 Ouestionnaires: 56

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 0 10 12 32 4.35 804/1669 4.35 4.42 4.23 4.02 4.35 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 1 9 17 27 4.24 908/1666 4.24 4.33 4.19 4.11 4.24 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4 0 6 11 34 4.29 781/1421 4.29 4.42 4.21 4.29 4.11 4.29 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 2 3 3 2 21 24 4.13 934/1617 4.13 4.29 4.15 3.99 4.13 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 3 12 10 29 4.15 665/1555 4.15 4.26 4.00 3.92 4.15 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 4 10 13 26 4.04 876/1543 4.04 4.15 4.06 3.86 4.04 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 3 1 9 16 25 4.09 997/1647 4.09 4.33 4.12 4.06 4.09 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 23 30 4.57 1151/1668 4.57 4.68 4.67 4.62 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 1 1 10 16 14 3.98 970/1605 3.98 4.22 4.07 3.96 3.98 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 1 1 4 13 34 4.47 845/1514 4.47 4.66 4.39 4.32 4.47 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 1 0 3 9 40 4.64 1055/1551 4.64 4.90 4.66 4.55 4.64 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 12 12 26 4.13 987/1503 4.13 4.50 4.24 4.17 4.13 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 1 1 2 10 11 29 4.23 934/1506 4.23 4.53 4.26 4.17 4.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0 1 1 7 11 31 4.37 357/1311 4.37 4.15 3.85 3.68 4.37 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26 0 1 9 5 12 3.80 1003/1490 3.80 3.97 4.05 3.85 3.80 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0 3 2 7 18 4.33 818/1502 4.33 4.36 4.26 4.06 4.33 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0 01 2 10 17 4.43 765/1489 4.43 4.52 4.29 4.07 4.43 4. Were special techniques successful 26 7 2 3 4 6 8 3.65 700/1006 3.65 3.83 4.00 3.81 3.65 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 55 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 112 \*\*\*\* 4.88 4.38 4.04 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	19	 Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	8	Under-grad	56	Non-major	38
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	2						

Course Section: HIST 200 0101 University of Maryland JAN 18, 2007

Page 1019

Job IRBR3029

Title Baltimore County 20TH CENTURY WORLD Instructor: COHEN, WARREN (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 87

Questionnaires: 47 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncie			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	l vou gain :	new insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	10	16	20	4.17	1014/1669	4.17	4.42	4.23	4.34	4.17
		uctor make clear			0	0	2	1	16	20	8		1395/1666		4.33	4.19	4.29	3.66
		questions reflec			0	0	0	4	11	19	13		1078/1421		4.42	4.24	4.35	3.87
4. Did	l other eva	luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	3	2	16	18	7	3.52	1364/1617	3.52	4.29	4.15	4.24	3.52
5. Did	assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	21	11	3.63	1155/1555	3.63	4.26	4.00	3.96	3.63
6. Did	l written a	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	6	0	10	18	11	3.62	1215/1543	3.62	4.15	4.06	4.10	3.62
7. Was	the gradi	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	1	4	12	11	17	3.87	1196/1647	3.87	4.33	4.12	4.19	3.87
8. How	many time	s was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	46	4.98	214/1668	4.98	4.68	4.67	4.59	4.98
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	1	1	1	12	14	12	3.88	1116/1605	3.84	4.22	4.07	4.15	3.84
		Tashii	_															
1 Wor	o the inst	Lectur ructor's lecture		nanarad	1	0	0	1	1	1 /	30	4.59	703/1514	1 56	1 66	4.39	4.39	4.56
		uctor seem inter			1	-	0	0	1	8	37	4.78	, -			4.66	4.72	
				explained clearly	1		0	2	9	-	22	4.20	,		4.50	4.24	4.29	4.19
		res contribute t			1	-	0	2					809/1506			4.26	4.33	
				your understanding	3	-	4	1	_				796/1311				3.96	
J. Dia	addiovibu	ar cccimiques en	riance y	our unactistanding	3		-	_	O		13	3.71	75071511	3.71	1.13	3.03	3.50	3.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	l class dis	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	27	0	2	4	7	4	3		1317/1490		3.97	4.05	4.11	3.10
				ed to participate	27		1	3	6	6			1319/1502		4.36	4.26	4.31	3.45
		_		d open discussion	27		0	1	5	9			1125/1489	3.90	4.52	4.29	4.36	3.90
4. Wer	e special	techniques succe	ssful		26	18	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1006	****	3.83	4.00	3.99	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	ıtio	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	' 4	0.00-0.99	1	A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	8	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	15
28-55	5 5	1.00-1.99	1	В 22						-						_		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 16		Ger	nera:	L				8	Under-g	rad 4	<u>1</u> 7	Non-	-major	32
84-15	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				2	16						
				? 1														

Course Section: HIST 200 0101 University of Maryland

Page 1020 Title 20TH CENTURY WORLD Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN (Instr. B) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 87

Questionnaires: 47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	10	16	20	4.17	1014/1669	4.17	4.42	4.23	4.34	4.17
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	2	1	16	20	8	3.66	1395/1666	3.66	4.33	4.19	4.29	3.66
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	4	11	19	13	3.87	1078/1421	3.87	4.42	4.24	4.35	3.87
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	3	2	16	18	7	3.52	1364/1617	3.52	4.29	4.15	4.24	3.52
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	21	11	3.63	1155/1555	3.63	4.26	4.00	3.96	3.63
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	6	0	10	18	11	3.62	1215/1543	3.62	4.15	4.06	4.10	3.62
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	1	4	12	11	17	3.87	1196/1647	3.87	4.33	4.12	4.19	3.87
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	46	4.98	214/1668	4.98	4.68	4.67	4.59	4.98
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	10	1	0	0	12	19	5	3.81	1172/1605	3.84	4.22	4.07	4.15	3.84
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	9	0	0	0	4	10	24	4.53	775/1514	4.56	4.66	4.39	4.39	4.56
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	9	0	0	0	3	7	28	4.66	1042/1551	4.72	4.90	4.66	4.72	4.72
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	9	0	0	1	7	14	16	4.18	941/1503	4.19	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.19
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	9	0	0	0	5	12	21	4.42	744/1506	4.40	4.53	4.26	4.33	4.40
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	11	1	0	1	10	9	15	4.09	547/1311	3.91	4.15	3.85	3.96	3.91
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	27	0	2	4	7	4	3	3.10	1317/1490	3.10	3.97	4.05	4.11	3.10
				ed to participate	27	0	1	3	6	6	4	3.45	1319/1502		4.36	4.26	4.31	3.45
				d open discussion	27	0	0	1	5	9	5		1125/1489		4.52	4.29	4.36	3.90
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		26	18	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1006	****	3.83	4.00	3.99	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99		A 1					or M			8	Graduat		 0	Mo de		15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1 1	B 22		кес	quir	eu I	OT M	a jor	Ö	O	Graduat	E	U	Majo	ıΤ	13
28-55 56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	B 22 C 16		Cos	nera	1				8	Under-q	rad /	17	Non	major	32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1		Gei	nela	Τ.				O	onder-g	rau 4	t/	MOII-	·iiia JOI	34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 7	F 0		<b>₽</b> 14	ecti <sup>.</sup>	.,,				1	#### - 1	Maana t	here s	re not	- 220110	h
Grau.	U	3.30- <del>1</del> .00	,	P 0		11.7.6	CCLI	v C D				_	respons				_	11
				I 0		O+1	her				2	6	T Cabolla	נט נט ג	c argi	ıııcaı		
				1 0		ULI	TICI				2	U						

1

Course Section: HIST 201 0101 University of Maryland INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST Baltimore County

Title Fall 2006 Instructor: RITSCHEL, DANIE

Page 1021

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	52	
Questionnaires:	40	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did v	vou gain n	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	3	3	6	8	20	3.97	1207/1669	3.98	4.42	4.23	4.34	3.97
_	-	ctor make clear the e		0	0	1	2	8	10	19	4.10	1037/1666	4.10	4.33	4.19	4.29	4.10
		uestions reflect the	_	1	28	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	871/1421	4.18	4.42	4.24	4.35	4.18
4. Did o	other eval	uations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	3	1	2	2	9	23	4.38	673/1617	4.38	4.29	4.15	4.24	4.38
		eadings contribute to		0	0	4	2	7	8	19	3.90	939/1555	3.90	4.26	4.00	3.96	3.90
6. Did w	written as	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	2	3	6	8	21	4.07	850/1543	4.07	4.15	4.06	4.10	4.07
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearly expl	ained	0	0	1	3	10	7	19	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.00
8. How n	many times	was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	214/1668	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.59	4.97
9. How w	would you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	12	14	10	3.77	1202/1605	3.77	4.22	4.07	4.15	3.77
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	1	1	5	8	24	4.36	1003/1514	4.36	4.66	4.39	4.39	4.36
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	33	4.79	806/1551	4.79	4.90	4.66	4.72	4.79
3. Was l	lecture ma	terial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	4	6	12	17	4.08	1030/1503	4.08	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.08
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute to what	you learned	1	0	5	1	9	6	18	3.79	1228/1506	3.79	4.53	4.26	4.33	3.79
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	1	25	5	1	3	1	4	2.86	1173/1311	2.86	4.15	3.85	3.96	2.86
		Discussion															
1. Did o	class disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	3	0	2	6	4	8	17	3.86	974/1490	3.86	3.97	4.05	4.11	3.86
2. Were	all stude	nts actively encourag	ed to participate	3	0	0	6	4	3	24	4.22	907/1502	4.22	4.36	4.26	4.31	4.22
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	3	0	2	3	4	5	23	4.19	960/1489	4.19	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.19
4. Were	special t	echniques successful		3	20	2	0	5	2	8	3.82	635/1006	3.82	3.83	4.00	3.99	3.82
			Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits	Farnod	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				D.C	ason	<b>a</b>			Tyr	00			Majors	
	Earned							:a5011	.a 				 he			S	, 
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 2	A 13		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	25
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	В 19													_	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	40	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	33	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: HIST 273 0101 University of Maryland HIST OF JEWS: MODRN TIM

> I ?

1

Title Baltimore County Instructor: SHIMOFF, SANDRA Fall 2006

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1022

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	633/1669	4.48	4.42	4.23	4.34	4.48
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	957/1666	4.19	4.33	4.19	4.29	4.19
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	789/1421	4.29	4.42	4.24	4.35	4.29
	_	uations reflect		_	2	5	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.29	4.15	4.24	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	453/1555	4.38	4.26	4.00	3.96	4.38
				o what you learned	1	9	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.15	4.06	4.10	4.33
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.33
	-	was class canc			1	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	713/1668	4.90	4.68	4.67	4.59	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1132/1605	3.86	4.22	4.07	4.15	3.86
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	Lecture e instructor's lectures instructor seem intere		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	408/1514	4.77	4.66	4.39	4.39	4.77
					1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	862/1551	4.76	4.90	4.66	4.72	4.76
		tructor seem interested in t material presented and expl	3	2	0	0	0	3	5	12		653/1503	4.45	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.45	
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.53	4.26	4.33	4.62
				our understanding	1	8	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	349/1311	4.38	4.15	3.85	3.96	4.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	742/1490	4.20	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.20
				d to participate	8	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	800/1502	4.36	4.36	4.26	4.31	4.36
				d open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.52	4.29	4.36	4.67
		echniques succe		-	7	9	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1006	4.83	3.83	4.00	3.99	4.83
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	awnad	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	asons				т				Majors	
crearts E		Cuiii. GPA							asons	· - – – –			Ту:				Majors 	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5				_										
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ge	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0											_			_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					3						

Course Section: HIST 304 0101 University of Maryland Title U.S.& VIETNAM WAR

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON

Enrollment: 96 Questionnaires: 59 Fall 2006

Page 1023 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	0	2	9	44	4.70	345/1669	4.70	4.42	4.23	4.28	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	44	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	6	47	4.77	267/1421	4.77	4.42	4.24	4.25	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	1	1	15	36	4.62	370/1617	4.62	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	558/1555	4.25	4.26	4.00	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	1	15	35	4.52	380/1543	4.52	4.15	4.06	4.14	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	1	6	44	4.62	356/1647	4.62	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	7	47	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	15	33	4.65	249/1605	4.65	4.22	4.07	4.09	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	49	4.91	189/1514	4.91	4.66	4.39	4.46	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	5	49	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	17	37	4.69	360/1503	4.69	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	9	44	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.53	4.26	4.30	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	3	14	35	4.55	246/1311	4.55	4.15	3.85	3.97	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	3	0	5	8	11	3.89	965/1490	3.89	3.97	4.05	4.11	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	2	3	7	15	4.18	932/1502	4.18	4.36	4.26	4.28	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	574/1489	4.63	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	32	19	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	****/1006	***	3.83	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar	г.с	1	^	^	0	0	2	г оо	++++/ 110	****	4 00	4 20	4 52	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	1 1	0	0	0	0 1		4.50	****/ 112 ****/ 97	****	4.88	4.38	4.53	****
<ol> <li>Was the instructor available for individual attention</li> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	56 56	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97 ****/ 92	****	4.80	4.36 4.22	4.12 4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 105	****	4.50 3.75	4.22	4.47	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 98	***	3.75	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work	F C	^	1	_	0	-1	-1	2 22	++++/	++++	++++	4 00	4 00	++++
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	1 1	2	4.67 4.67	****/ 39 ****/ 40	****	****	4.39 3.97	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56 56	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	סכ	Т	U	U	Т	U	Т	4.00	/ 30			4.33	3.43	
Self Paced			_			_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56 56	0	0	0	0 1	2	1	4.33	****/ 46 ****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
<ol> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> <li>Were there enough proctors for all the students</li> </ol>	56 56	0	0	0	1	1 1	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	3.00 4.13	****
o. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	U	U	U	Τ	Τ	Τ.	4.00	/ 29	*		4.34	+.⊥3	

Course Section: HIST 304 0101
Title U.S.& VIETNAM WAR

Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON

Enrollment: 96
Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1023 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	27	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	9	С	0	General	26	Under-grad	58	Non-major	44
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	2						

Course Section: HIST 355B 0101

HIST OF EAST ASIAN REL

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County INGEMAN, LARA Fall 2006

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1024

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 17

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	256/1669	4.76	4.42	4.23	4.28	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	306/1666	4.71	4.33	4.19	4.20	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	267/1421	4.76	4.42	4.24	4.25	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	408/1555	4.44	4.26	4.00	4.03	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	362/1543	4.53	4.15	4.06	4.14	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0			4.75	213/1647		4.33	4.12	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	769/1605	4.19	4.22	4.07	4.09	4.19
Lecture	0		•	•	0	2	1.0	4 00	260/1514	4 00	1	4 20	4 46	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	360/1514		4.66	4.39	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0		13	4.87		4.87	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	212/1506	4.87	4.53	4.26	4.30	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	219/1311	4.60	4.15	3.85	3.97	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	558/1490	4.40	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	415/1502	4.73	4.36	4.26	4.28	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	456/1489	4.73	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	381/1006		3.83	4.00		4.25
i. Were special teciniques successiai	3	2	O	O	2	,	,	1.25	301/1000	1.25	3.03	1.00	1.10	1.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work	1.0	0	_	•	0	0	-	F 00		als als als als	also also also also	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58		****	4.22	4.29	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
5. Here shere chough proceeds for all the seauches	10	J	J	0	J	J	_	3.00	, 25			1.51	1.13	

Course Section: HIST 355B 0101

Title HIST OF EAST ASIAN REL

Instructor: INGEMAN, LARA

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 17

1NGEMAN, LAKA 27 Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1024 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 355H 0101 University of Maryland THE CAMERA AT WAR

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0

3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title HUDGINS, NICOLE Instructor:

Enrollment: 17 Ouestionnaires: 16

Page 1025 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 97 \*\*\*\* 4.80 4.36 4.12 \*\*\*\*

0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 98 \*\*\*\* 3.00 3.95 4.15 \*\*\*\*

0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 105 \*\*\*\* 3.75 4.20 4.45 \*\*\*\*

0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.22 4.47 \*\*\*\*

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	1400/1669	3.69	4.42	4.23	4.28	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	1257/1666	3.88	4.33	4.19	4.20	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	6	3	3.64	1312/1617	3.64	4.29	4.15	4.22	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.26	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1277/1543	3.47	4.15	4.06	4.14	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	1012/1647	4.06	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	3	10	1	3.56	1330/1605	3.56	4.22	4.07	4.09	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	Λ	0	2	2	11	4.60	679/1514	4 60	4.66	4.39	4.46	4 60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.90	4.66		4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	n	0	4	6	6	4.13	996/1503	4.13	4.50	4.24	4.28	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	n	1	3	6	6		1042/1506	4.06	4.53	4.26		4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	n	0	2	4	10	4.50	264/1311		4.15	3.85	3.97	
5. Did dadiovisual ecciniques cimanee your didersemaning	U	O	Ü	U	2	1	10	1.50	201/1311	1.50	1.15	3.03	3.77	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	7	3	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.97	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1502	4.45	4.36	4.26	4.28	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	648/1489	4.55	4.52	4.29	4.35	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	****	3.83	4.00	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.53	****

#### Frequency Distribution

15 0 0

15 0

1 0 0

0

0

0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 374 0101 University of Maryland

Title EURO WOMENS HIST TO 17 Baltimore County Fall 2006

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

Instructor: FROIDE, AMY

Enrollment: 43 Ouestionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1026

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

256/1502 4.88 4.36 4.26 4.28 4.88

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 8 17 4.43 705/1669 4.43 4.42 4.23 4.28 4.43 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 0 2 7 18 4.46 605/1666 4.46 4.33 4.19 4.20 4.46 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 18 1 0 0 2 6 4.33 746/1421 4.33 4.42 4.24 4.25 4.33 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 2 1 3 6 14 4.12 958/1617 4.12 4.29 4.15 4.22 4.12 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 5 23 4.82 132/1555 4.82 4.26 4.00 4.03 4.82 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 2 9 14 4.26 659/1543 4.26 4.15 4.06 4.14 4.26 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 3 5 19 4.50 481/1647 4.50 4.33 4.12 4.14 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 11 16 4.59 1131/1668 4.59 4.68 4.67 4.68 4.59 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 1 8 13 4.55 343/1605 4.55 4.22 4.07 4.09 4.55 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 1 0 4 21 4.59 691/1514 4.59 4.66 4.39 4.46 4.59 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 2 24 4.85 650/1551 4.85 4.90 4.66 4.70 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 254/1503 4.78 4.50 4.24 4.28 4.78 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 0 2 3 20 4.44 718/1506 4.44 4.53 4.26 4.30 4.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 6 1 0 2 5 12 4.35 373/1311 4.35 4.15 3.85 3.97 4.35 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 3 22 4.88 155/1490 4.88 3.97 4.05 4.11 4.88

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 2 23 4.92 224/1489 4.92 4.52 4.29 4.35 4.92 4. Were special techniques successful 3 2 1 0 5 7 10 4.09 463/1006 4.09 3.83 4.00 4.10 4.09

#### Frequency Distribution

3 0

0

0

0 3 22 4.88

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	28	Non-major	14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 407 0101 Title

FOUNDING OF AMER NATIO

3.50-4.00

Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 29

Grad.

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1027 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

								Fr	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 Genera	 1															
1.	Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	269/1669	4.76	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.76
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	193/1666		4.33	4.19	4.22	4.79
			estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	280/1421	4.76	4.42	4.24	4.38	4.76
		_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	300/1617		4.29	4.15	4.22	4.69
					what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	18	4.41	428/1555	4.41	4.26	4.00	4.08	4.41
		_	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	20	4.48	415/1543		4.15	4.06	4.18	4.48
			system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	241/1647		4.33	4.12	4.14	4.72
			was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	913/1668	4.79	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.79
					ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	278/1605		4.22	4.07	4.16	4.63
			Lectur	<b>e</b>															
1.	Were t	he instri	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	132/1514	4.93	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.93
			tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.73	5.00
					explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.86	163/1503	4.86	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.86
			es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	115/1506		4.53	4.26	4.29	4.93
					your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	232/1311		4.15	3.85	3.88	4.58
			P																
1	ו הים		Discus			0	0	0	1	_	2	11	4 00	740/1400	4 00	2 07	4 05	1 26	4 00
					what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	3	11	4.20	742/1490		3.97	4.05	4.26	4.20
					ed to participate	-	0	0	0			14	4.60	540/1502		4.36	4.26	4.46	4.60
					nd open discussion	9	0	0 3	0	1 2	4	15 1	4.70	500/1489	4.70 ****	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.70 ****
4.	were s	peciai te	echniques succe	ssiui		9	14	3	U	2	U	Τ	2.33	****/1006		3.83	4.00	4.21	
			Labora	tory															
2.	Were y	ou provid	led with adequa	τe bacł	ground information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
3.	Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****
			Semina	r															
1.	Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	e announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.74	****
2.	Was th	e instruc	tor available	for ind	dividual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.69	****
3.	Did re	search pr	ojects contrib	ate to	what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****
4.	Did pr	esentatio	ns contribute	to what	you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	4.27	****
5.	Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear	·	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.86	****
					Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Cre	dits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	22
28	-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 13														
56	-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 2	19	Non-	-major	7
84	-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

20

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

F

Ρ

I

?

Course Section: HIST 429 0101

HISTORY OF BALTIMORE

Title

Instructor: JOHNSON, MICHAE

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1028 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1423/1669	3.63	4.42	4.23	4.39	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	7		1343/1666		4.33	4.19	4.22	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	12	4.26	806/1421	4.26	4.42	4.24	4.38	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	6	7	3.94	1112/1617	3.94	4.29	4.15	4.22	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	8	5	3.78	1045/1555	3.78	4.26	4.00	4.08	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1130/1543	3.76	4.15	4.06	4.18	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	1017/1647	4.06	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	750/1668	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1312/1605	3.60	4.22	4.07	4.16	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	6	3	7	3.74	1330/1514	3.74	4.66	4.39	4.45	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	917/1551	4.74	4.90	4.66	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	5	5	5	3.42	1358/1503	3.42	4.50	4.24	4.27	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	3	7	3.63	1288/1506	3.63	4.53	4.26	4.29	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	846/1311	3.67	4.15	3.85	3.88	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	7	1	4		1142/1490		3.97	4.05	4.26	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	2	3	6		1013/1502	4.00	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	930/1489	4.23	4.52	4.29		4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	914/1006	3.13	3.83	4.00	4.21	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.86	* * * *
Field Work		_	_			_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	***	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced		_				_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	***	****	4.45	4.92	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Course Section: HIST 429 0101

Title HISTORY OF BALTIMORE

Instructor: JOHNSON, MICHAE

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1028 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1029

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	34				
Questionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course Section: HIST 442 0101

U.S.:1917 TO 1945

MERINGOLO, DENI

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1462/1669	3.55	4.42	4.23	4.39	3.55
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.00
3. Did th	ıe exam qı	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	8	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.38	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	626/1617	4.42	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.42
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1062/1555	3.75	4.26	4.00	4.08	3.75
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.15	4.06	4.18	4.17
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	948/1647	4.17	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.17
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1241/1605	3.71	4.22	4.07	4.16	3.71
		Lectur	e.															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.83
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.25
		es contribute to			0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1319/1506	3.50	4.53	4.26	4.29	3.50
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	899/1311	3.58	4.15	3.85	3.88	3.58
		Discus	zion															
1 Did al	ace dieci			what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	1	3	3 36	1225/1490	3.36	3.97	4.05	4.26	3.36
				d to participate	1		1	0	0	1	9	4.55	595/1502		4.36	4.26	4.46	
				d open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	648/1489	4.55	4.52	4.29	4.52	
		echniques succe		a open discussion	1	7	1	0	1	0	2		759/1006			4.00		3.50
	-	-																
				Frequ	lency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Red	auire	ed f	 or Ma	aior		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		2.0	-1 ~ -1 ,		10		-	_	or addac	-	-		_	-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													5 2	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	яh
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her					5	-		5			
				? 0														

Course Section: HIST 445 0101 HISTORY OF SCIENCE TATAREWICZ, JOS

I

?

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

32

University of Maryland Page 1030 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Onestionr	aire

						Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		Genera			1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 60	470 /1660	1 60	4 40	4 22	4 20	1 (0
	id you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	T	0	1	-	9	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.60
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	1	0	3	6	4.50 4.50	549/1666 557/1421	4.50 4.50	4.33	4.19 4.24	4.22	4.50 4.50
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	2	1	6	4.44			4.42	4.15	4.22	4.44
				what you learned	1	1 0	0	0	2	2	6 6		438/1555	4.44	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.44
				what you learned to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.40	,		4.25	4.00		4.40
		system clearl			1	0	0	0	4	3	3		1161/1647	3.90	4.13	4.12		3.90
		was class canc		arned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.12		5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	631/1605		4.22	4.07		4.30
9. HOW W	ouid you g	rade the overa	II Lead	ming effectiveness	1	U	U	1	U	4	5	4.30	031/1605	4.30	4.22	4.07	4.10	4.30
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.40
2. Did t	he instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was 1	ecture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.33
4. Did t	he lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	958/1506	4.20	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	305/1311	4.44	4.15	3.85	3.88	4.44
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu			what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.00
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3		4.29	859/1502		4.36	4.26	4.46	4.29
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.86
		chniques succe			5	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006		3.83		4.21	***
		Labora	tory															
1 Did +	he lah inc		-	of the material	8	2	1	0	0	Ω	Λ	1 00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****
			_	ground information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
				for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****
				Frequ	0000	. Diat	- wib		-									
				rrequ	terrey	DISC	LIDI	utioi	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons					Ту			уре		Majors		3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Rec	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	ors 6		Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									J				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
								_	-									

Other

Course Section: HIST 447 0101

Title HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT

Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 32

5

University of Maryland Page 1031
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain now insights shills from this source.	2	0	0	1	1	6	2.1	1 60	448/1669	1 60	4 42	4.23	4 20	1 60
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	3 1	0	0	1	1 4	6 9	21 15	4.62 4.16			4.42	4.23	4.39 4.22	4.62 4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	7	19	4.10			4.33	4.19	4.22	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	1	0	6	11	8		1084/1617		4.42	4.15	4.22	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	7	17	4.41	428/1555		4.26	4.13	4.22	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	7	13	10	4.00		4.00	4.15	4.06	4.18	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	5	8	16	4.38			4.33	4.12	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	23	6		1412/1668		4.68	4.67	4.70	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	5	9	10	4.00			4.22	4.07		4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	8	17	4.38	984/1514	4.38	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	25	4.77	862/1551	4.77	4.90	4.66	4.73	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	4	19	4.30	835/1503	4.30	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	484/1506	4.66	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	3	1	5	7	6	3.55	919/1311	3.55	4.15	3.85	3.88	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	800/1490		3.97	4.05	4.26	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	4	2	11	4.16	944/1502		4.36	4.26	4.46	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50			4.52	4.29	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	13	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1006	****	3.83	4.00	4.21	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112		4.88	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.80	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		4.50	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	3.75	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00			****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: HIST 447 0101

Title HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT

Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 45
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1031 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	9	General	7	Under-grad	32	Non-major	15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course Section: HIST 456 0101 University of Maryland THE ROMAN EMPIRE BIRKENMEIER, JO

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 47 Ouestionnaires: 26

I	age	1032	
JAN	18,	2007	
Job	IRBI	R3029	

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	21	4.69	345/1669	4.69	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	305/1421	4.73	4.42	4.24	4.38	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	7	14	4.19	863/1617	4.19	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	17	4.35	484/1555	4.35	4.26	4.00	4.08	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	4	3	14	3.96	944/1543	3.96	4.15	4.06	4.18	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	16	4.35	744/1647	4.35	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	285/1668	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	642/1605	4.29	4.22	4.07	4.16	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	151/1514	4.92	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.92

#### 1. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 1 24 4.96 205/1551 4.96 4.90 4.66 4.73 4.96 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 17 4.52 537/1503 4.52 4.50 4.24 4.27 4.52 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 7 17 4.64 496/1506 4.64 4.53 4.26 4.29 4.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1 3 6 15 4.40 333/1311 4.40 4.15 3.85 3.88 4.40 Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	524/1490	4.44	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	468/1502	4.69	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.94	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	322/1006	4.38	3.83	4.00	4.21	4.38

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	3						

Baltimore County

Course Section: HIST 459 0101

35

JAPAN SINCE 1800

VAPORIS, CONSTA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Page 1033 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did	l you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	545/1669	4.55	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.55
2. Did	l the instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	814/1666	4.30	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.30
3. Did	l the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	683/1421	4.41	4.42	4.24	4.38	4.41
4. Did	l other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	651/1617	4.39	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.39
5. Did	l assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	308/1555	4.55	4.26	4.00	4.08	4.55
6. Did	l written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	838/1543	4.09	4.15	4.06	4.18	4.09
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	896/1647	4.23	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.23
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		1	1	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.67
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	15	3	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.22	4.07	4.16	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	923/1514	4.43	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.43
2. Did	l the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551		4.90	4.66	4.73	4.95
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	686/1503	4.43	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.43
4. Did	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	892/1506	4.27	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.27
5. Did	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						0	0	4	5	12	4.38	349/1311	4.38	4.15	3.85	3.88	4.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	l class disc			what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	380/1490	4.62	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.62
				d to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	12		189/1502		4.36	4.26		4.92
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	422/1489	4.77	4.52	4.29		4.77
		echniques succe			10	3	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	459/1006		3.83			4.10
				Frequ	ionai	. Dia	t wib	1+101	n									
				rrequ	aeric y	DIS	CIID	20101	.1									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	рe			Majors	\$
00-27	· ' 1	0.00-0.99	1	A 3		Re	guir	ed fo	or M	 ajor		5	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	13
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 13			1		-	,	-	-	- 2-2-2-2	-	-	5		
56-83		2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ger	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 2	:3	Non-	major	10
84-15		3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5				3	
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 1				Electives 0 #### - Means there are n				re not	enouc	ιh							
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot]	her				1	.0	-					
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1034 JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	38		
Questionnaires:	25	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: HIST 462 0101

MEDIEVAL EUROPE

MCDONOUGH, SUSA

Title

Instructor:

	- L			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.56	522/1669	4.56	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	577/1666		4.33	4.19	4.22	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	939/1421		4.42	4.24	4.38	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	15	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	340/1555		4.26	4.00	4.08	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	516/1543		4.15	4.06	4.18	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	14	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	570/1668		4.68	4.67	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	512/1605		4.22	4.07	4.16	4.39
	_	-	-		_	-			,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	569/1514	4.68	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	205/1551	4.96	4.90	4.66	4.73	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	464/1503	4.60	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	458/1506	4.68	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	326/1311	4.42	4.15	3.85	3.88	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	742/1490	4.19	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	585/1489	4.62	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	3	4	2	1	4	2.93	940/1006	2.93	3.83	4.00	4.21	2.93
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	um. GPA Expected Grades Reasor					Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 471 0101 University of Maryland Title BRITAIN: 1714-1848

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Instructor: FROIDE, AMY

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	<u>-</u>				Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ω	0	0	0	Λ	Ω	15	4.65	404/1669	4.65	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	764/1666		4.33	4.19	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	331/1421	4.71	4.42	4.24	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1.0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	475/1617	4.52	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	262/1555		4.26	4.13	4.22	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	Τ.	7	14	4.55	353/1543	4.55	4.15	4.06	4.18	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.23	896/1647	4.23	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.23
3 3 1 1	U T	0	0	0	0	8	15		1077/1668		4.53	4.12	4.14	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.05	525/1605		4.08			
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes		U	U	U	U	TT	/	4.39	525/1005	4.39	4.22	4.07	4.16	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	257/1514	4.87	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	300/1503	4.74	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	509/1506		4.53	4.26	4.29	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	2	5	3	5	3.41	989/1311	3.41	4.15	3.85	3.88	3.41
5. Dia addiovistati recimitques cimanee your understanding	_	5	2	2	J	5	,	3.11	202/1311	3.11	1.13	3.03	3.00	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	495/1502	4.65	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	280/1489	4.90	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	779/1006	3.47	3.83	4.00	4.21	3.47
I. Here special committees successive		J	_	_			-	3.17	,,,,,	3.17	3.03	1.00		J. 17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****

Page 1035

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P 0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I 0	Other	15	-			
				? 1						

Course Section: HIST 477 0101 University of Maryland Title HISTORY OF CHINA TO 16

Baltimore County

Instructor: INGEMAN, LARA 36

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 17

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1036

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

	- 1				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	461/1666	4.59	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	710/1421	4.38	4.42	4.24	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	461/1555	4.38	4.26	4.00	4.08	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	857/1543	4.06	4.15	4.06	4.18	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	345/1647	4.63	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1057/1605	3.93	4.22	4.07	4.16	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1143/1551	4.56	4.90	4.66	4.73	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	112/1311	4.81	4.15	3.85	3.88	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	6	3	3.62	1112/1490	3.62	3.97	4.05	4.26	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1154/1502	3.85	4.36	4.26	4.46	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1006	***	3.83	4.00	4.21	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: HIST 488 0101 University of Maryland Title EUROPE, 1914 TO PRESEN

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

Page 1037 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Quest:	lonnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	----------

	Questions					NA		eque:		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																
1 Did voi	u dain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	this course	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	793/1669	4.35	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.35
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	993/1666	4.15	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.15
		estions reflec			1	8	1	1	2	5	3		1166/1421	3.67	4.42	4.24	4.38	3.67
		ations reflect			1	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	750/1617	4.30	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.30
				hat you learned	1	0	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	741/1555	4.05	4.26	4.00	4.08	4.05
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	598/1543	4.32	4.15	4.06	4.18	4.32
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ned	1	1	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	1113/1647	3.95	4.33	4.12	4.14	3.95
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1382/1668	4.25	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.25
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	525/1605	4.39	4.22	4.07	4.16	4.39
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture			1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	441/1514		4.66	4.39	4.45	4.75
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	307/1551	4.95	4.90	4.66	4.73	4.95
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	510/1503	4.55	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.55
		ou learned	1	0 1	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	718/1506	4.45	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.45		
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir							0	4	4	10	4.16	507/1311	4.16	4.15	3.85	3.88	4.16
		Discus																
				hat you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	576/1490	4.39	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.39
		-	_	l to participate	3	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	,	4.44	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.44
				l open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56		4.56	4.52	4.29	4.52	4.56
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	4	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	441/1006	4.13	3.83	4.00	4.21	4.13
		Labora	-															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backs	ground information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	ason	s			Туј	рe			Majors	5
00-27							 quir	ed f	 or M	aior	 `s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	12
28-55													5_ 5.5.5.00	-	-	) ~		
56-83						Ge	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	9
84-150	-150 7 3.00-3.49 5 D 0												5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	gh
	P 1												respons				_	
	I 0					Ot	her				1	.0	-					
	? 1																	

Course Section: HIST 494 0101 University of Maryland Title COLLOQUIUM WORLD HISTO Baltimore County

COLLOQUIUM WORLD HISTO Baltimore County SIMPSON, BRAD Fall 2006

Instructor: SIMPSON, BRAD

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1038 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General														
1 Did voi	u dain ne	ew insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.25
		ctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3		1094/1666	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.00
		estions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0		****/1421	****	4.42	4.24	4.38	****
	_	nations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.25
		eadings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	171/1555		4.26	4.00	4.08	4.75
		signments contribute to what you learned		0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	,		4.15	4.06	4.18	4.13
		g system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	2		1187/1647	3.88	4.33	4.12	4.14	3.88
		was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668		4.68	4.67		5.00
		grade the overall teaching effectivenes	_	0	0	1	0	3	2		,		4.22	4.07		4.00
J. 110W WO	ara you s	grade the overall teaching effectivenes	5 2	U	U	_	U	J	2	1.00	J10/1003	1.00	7.22	1.07	4.10	1.00
		Lecture														
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.25
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.90	4.66	4.73	4.88
3. Was led	cture mat	cerial presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1180/1503	3.88	4.50	4.24	4.27	3.88
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1305/1506	3.57	4.53	4.26	4.29	3.57
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1208/1311	2.67	4.15	3.85	3.88	2.67
		Discussion	_	_		_	_		_							
		ussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	Ţ	Τ	0	5	4.29	667/1490		3.97	4.05	4.26	4.29
		nts actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502		4.36	4.26	4.46	5.00
		ctor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.21	4.00
		Seminar														
1 Were as	agianed t	copics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	48/ 112	4.75	4.88	4.38	4.74	4.75
	_	ctor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 97		4.80	4.36	4.69	5.00
		rojects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	42/ 92		4.50	4.22	4.48	4.50
		ons contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	60/ 105	4.25	3.75	4.22	4.27	4.25
		4	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	,			3.95			
5. were c	5. Were criteria for grading made clear						U	U	2	3.00	82/ 98	3.00	3.00	3.95	3.80	3.00
		Fre	quency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0					 equir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0 B 3			-											

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

Course Section: HIST 496 0101 University of Maryland Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH Baltimore County Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

21

University of Maryland Page 1039
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

O L	a	The second second second	Ouestionnaire	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie	

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	534/1669	4.56	4.42	4.23	4.39	4.56
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.33	4.19	4.22	4.67
		uestions reflec			1	14	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	****	4.42	4.24	4.38	***
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	123/1617	4.88	4.29	4.15	4.22	4.88
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	428/1555	4.41	4.26	4.00	4.08	4.41
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	218/1543	4.71	4.15	4.06	4.18	4.71
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	241/1647	4.72	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.72
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	952/1668	4.76	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.76
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.22	4.07	4.16	4.67
		Lectur	٩															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	537/1514	4.69	4.66	4.39	4.45	4.69
					4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.73	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	1	3	9	4.62	451/1503	4.62	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.62
		es contribute t		-	5	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	693/1506	4.46	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.46
				our understanding	4	2	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	744/1311	3.83	4.15	3.85	3.88	3.83
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.97	4.05	4.26	4.67
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.46	5.00
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.52	5.00
		echniques succe			6	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006		3.83	4.00	4.21	4.80
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	ution	n									
a 11. =	2					_					_							
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	14
28-55																		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C 1		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0					Ot]	her				1	.7						

University of Maryland Page 1040
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

1

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionn	ire

Course Section: HIST 629 0101

8

HISTORY OF BALTIMORE

JOHNSON, MICHAE

Title

Grad.

5

3.50-4.00 4

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

									Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	3			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			General	 																
1. D	id vou	gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.42	4.23	4.35	4.57
			ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1001/1666	4.14	4.33	4.19	4.19	4.14
			uestions reflect				0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.57
4. D	id oth	er evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goal	ls	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.29	4.15	4.24	4.57
5. D	id ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you le	earned	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. D	id wri	tten as	signments contri	bute t	o what you	learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.15	4.06	4.27	4.50
7. W	as the	grading	g system clearly	/ expla	ined		1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.33	4.12	4.15	4.00
8. H	low mar	y times	was class cance	elled			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. H	low wou	ıld you 🤉	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effec	tiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.22	4.07	4.13	4.33
			Lecture	2																
1 W	lere th	e instr	uctor's lectures	_	prepared		0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3 86	1288/1514	3.86	4.66	4.39	4.37	3.86
			ect	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00			
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearl</li> </ol>								0	0	2	3	2		1066/1503	4.00	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.00
			es contribute to				0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	884/1506	4.29	4.53	4.26	4.24	4.29
			l techniques enh		-		0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	426/1311	4.29	4.15	3.85	3.89	
1 5		41	Discuss				0	0	^	0	_	_	_	4 71	000/1400	4 71	2 07	4 05	4 10	4 71
			ussions contribu		-		0	0	0	0	1	2 0	5 6	4.71	298/1490	4.71	3.97 4.36	4.05	4.18	4.71
			nts actively end ctor encourage f				0	0	0	0	1	0	7	5.00	438/1502 1/1489	4.71 5.00	4.52	4.26	4.46	4.71 5.00
			echniques succes		a open ais	cussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.83	4.29	4.44	4.00
	OLC DE	.corar o	201111144422 240001	, D L U L			_	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	-	_	_	1.00	1,3,1000	1.00	3.03	1.00		1.00
			Laborat	cory																
3. W	ere ne	cessary	materials avail	lable f	or lab act	ivities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
	Fre						iencv	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-	27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	1	Graduat	e	5	Majo	r	7
28-	55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	Required for Majors 1									_				
56-	83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General 3					3	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0		
84-	150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0	5													

Electives

Other

0

0

0

F

Р

I

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Course Section: HIST 642 0101 Title U.S.:1917 TO 1945 Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 6

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 1041

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Frequenc						ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.42	4.23	4.35	4.00
2. Did th	he instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.33	4.19	4.19	4.00
3. Did th	he exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the e	expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.50
4. Did of	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.29	4.15	4.24	4.50
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.83	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.83
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.15	4.06	4.27	4.17
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.33	4.12	4.15	4.33
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.22	4.07	4.13	3.75
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	0	5	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.66	4.39	4.37	4.67
2. Did th	he instruc	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.50
4. Did th	he lecture	es contribute t	to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	980/1506	4.17	4.53	4.26	4.24	4.17
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques er	nhance y	your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.15	3.85	3.89	4.00
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	3.97	4.05	4.18	3.50
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did th	he instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.44	5.00
		echniques succe		-	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.83	4.00	4.11	3.00
		Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n											
Credits 1	cedits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re:	ason	5			Ту	ne			Majors	<b>:</b>
	Barred Cam. Or Barretta Grades																	, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	1	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		~		,				1	1	,	-			-
56-83	Ω	2 00-2 99	()	C 0		(+e)	nera	1				1	IInder-a	rad	1	NOn-	-maior	

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

Course Section: HIST 656 0101

3

THE ROMAN EMPIRE

BIRKENMEIER, JO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Page 1042 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.42	4.23	4.35	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.33	4.19	4.19	5.00
		uestions reflect	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.29	4.15	4.24	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.26	4.00	4.07	5.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2		1/1543	5.00	4.15	4.06	4.27	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1647	5.00	4.33	4.12	4.15	5.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.83	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.22	4.07	4.13	4.67
		Lecture																
		uctor's lecture:			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.66	4.39	4.37	5.00
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		386/1503	4.67	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.67
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.53	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.15	3.85	3.89	5.00
		Discus				_		_	_									
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.97	4.05	4.18	4.67
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.46	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.83	4.00	4.11	5.00
				Frequ	ı en ası	nia:	trib	1+ i 01	2									
				riequ	испсу	ומבע	CIID	10101	.1									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	1	Graduate	e	1	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1						
				? 0														

Course Section: HIST 671 0101 University of Maryland INDUSTRIAL BRITAIN

Title Instructor: FROIDE, AMY

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Page 1043 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.42	4.23	4.35	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	2		1387/1666	3.67	4.33	4.19	4.19	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.29	4.15	4.24	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	4.26	4.00	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.15	4.06	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	4.33	4.12	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.22	4.07	4.13	4.33
Lecture	0	•	•	•	0	-	0	4 60	504/1514	4 60	4	4 20	4 25	4 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.66	4.39	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.50	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.53	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	389/1311	4.33	4.15	3.85	3.89	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.97	4.05	4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	865/1489	4.33	4.52	4.29	4.44	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	841/1006	3.33	3.83	4.00	4.11	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.88	4.38	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.80	4.36	4.39	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	3.75	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	U	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.75	4.20 3.95	3.93	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	4	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	40/ 98	4.00	3.00	3.95	3.93	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

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

Course Section: HIST 677 0101 University of Maryland HISTORY OF CHINA TO 16 Baltimore County

Title Instructor: INGEMAN, LARA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1044 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.42	4.23	4.35	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	0		1541/1666		4.33	4.19		3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	0		1222/1421	3.50	4.42	4.24		3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1		801/1617		4.29	4.15	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1260/1543	3.50	4.15	4.06	4.27	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.33	4.12	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1614/1668	3.75	4.68	4.67	4.83	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1455/1605	3.25	4.22	4.07	4.13	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.66	4.39	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,		4.50	4.24	4.22	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,		4.53	4.26		4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	4.67	4.15	3.85	3.89	
~.														
Discussion	-	0	•	_	0	-	•	0 00	1 400 /1 400	0 00	2 0 1	4 05	4 10	0 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	0		1473/1490		3.97	4.05	4.18	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1			1013/1502 865/1489	4.00	4.36	4.26 4.29		4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1 1	0 2	0 1	0	0	2	0		1005/1006		3.83	4.29	4.44 4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	1005/1006	1.00	3.83	4.00	4.11	1.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.88	4.38	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.80	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	63/ 92	4.00	4.50	4.22	4.36	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,		3.75	4.20		1.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	97/ 98	1.00	3.00	3.95	3.93	1.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Evpeated Crades				Po	acone				Тът	20			Majorg	

Fall 2006

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

Course Section: HIST 688 0101 Title

EUROPE, 1914 TO PRESEN

Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

84-150

Grad.

0

5

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 5

0

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1045 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.42	4.23	4.35	4.44
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1250/1666	3.89	4.33	4.19	4.19	3.89
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflec	ct the	expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	657/1421	4.43	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.43
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	958/1617	4.11	4.29	4.15	4.24	4.11
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	492/1555	4.33	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	465/1543	4.44	4.15	4.06	4.27	4.44
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	984/1647	4.11	4.33	4.12	4.15	4.11
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1329/1668	4.33	4.68	4.67	4.83	4.33
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.22	4.07	4.13	4.11
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	739/1514	4.56	4.66	4.39	4.37	4.56
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	rested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.90	4.66	4.72	4.89
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	905/1503	4.22	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.22
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	934/1506	4.22	4.53	4.26	4.24	4.22
				your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	305/1311	4.44		3.85	3.89	4.44
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1036/1490	3.75	3.97	4.05	4.18	3.75
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	ncourag	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.00
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.52	4.29	4.44	4.25
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	essful		1	0	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	717/1006	3.63	3.83	4.00	4.11	3.63
		Semina	ar															
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to th	e announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was th	e instruc	tor available	for in	dividual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did re	search pr	ojects contrib	oute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did pr	esentatio	ns contribute	to wha	t you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	4.23	***
_		or grading mad		-	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.93	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	t.
			<u>.</u> 							- 								
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A 3	Required for Majors		3	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	7				
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5	-													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
04 1 5 0	^	2 00 2 40	^	D 0														

Electives

Other

2

5

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

D 0

0

0

F 0

P

I

?

Course Section: HIST 701 0101 Title STUDY OF HISTORY Instructor:

LINDENMEYER, KR

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19 Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1046 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	135/1669	4.89	4.42	4.23	4.35	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	149/1666		4.33	4.19	4.19	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1421	****	4.42	4.24	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	195/1617	4.78	4.29	4.15	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	153/1555	4.79	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	234/1543	4.68	4.15	4.06	4.27	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	156/1647	4.82	4.33	4.12	4.15	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	926/1668	4.79	4.68	4.67	4.83	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	131/1605	4.82	4.22	4.07	4.13	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	113/1514	4.95	4.66	4.39	4.37	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.95	4.90	4.66	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	144/1503	4.89	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	176/1506	4.89	4.53	4.26	4.24	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	255/1311	4.53	4.15	3.85	3.89	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	232/1490	4.79	3.97	4.05	4.18	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	142/1502	4.95	4.36	4.26	4.46	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	322/1006	4.38	3.83	4.00	4.11	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.88	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.75	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.00	3.95	3.93	****
Post					_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-	-	•	
				2	^						

Course Section: HIST 711 0101 University of Maryland COLLOQUIUM: AMER HISTO Baltimore County

Page 1047 Title JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: BRAMUCCI, NANCY Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Ougstiennsines:	2	

	-				
Questionnaires:	3	Stude	nt Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Fre	_	ncies	3		Inst		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.42	4.23	4.35	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	3							5.00
0	1	0	0	0	0	2						4.33	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	1	2				4.29	4.15	4.24	4.67
0	0	0	0	1	1	1				4.26	4.00	4.07	4.00
1 0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.15	4.06	4.27	4.67
0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.33	4.12	4.15	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.68	4.67	4.83	4.67
s 0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.22	4.07	4.13	4.67
0	^	^	0	0	0	2	F 00	1/151/	г оо	1	4 20	4 27	5.00
-													5.00
													5.00
_													
•	•	•	•	-	-								
U	U	U	U	U	Т	2	4.07	109/1311	4.07	4.15	3.05	3.09	4.07
1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.97	4.05	4.18	5.00
1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.46	5.00
1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.52	4.29	4.44	5.00
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.83	4.00	4.11	5.00
niency	, Dis	trib	ıt i oı	n									
acricy	DIS	CIID	2010										
5			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
	Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 3	0	Graduat	 e	1	Maic	or	3
					J ·						5		
	Ge:	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	0
								J				-	
	El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
								regnong	es to h			ıt.	
								T CDPOILD	CD CO X				
	Ot:	her					2	I CDPOID	CD CO 1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1  0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0	NR NA 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3  0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1  1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1  quency Distribution  Reasons  Required for Majors  General	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67  1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67  Required for Majors 0  General 1	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1669 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1666 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1421 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 773/1555 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1503 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1503 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1506 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1602 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1602 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1489 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0 Graduat  General 1 Under-g  Electives 0 #### - 1	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1669 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1666 5.00 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1421 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 323/1617 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 773/1555 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605 4.67  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1514 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1503 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1503 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1506 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.67  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1489 5.00 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0 Graduate  General 1 Under-grad  Electives 0 #### - Means to	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1669 5.00 4.42 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.42 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 323/1617 4.67 4.29 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 773/1555 4.00 4.26 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 4.67 4.15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 4.68 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605 4.67 4.22  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605 4.67 4.22  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 4.68 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1665 4.67 4.22  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.90 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.67 4.15  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.36 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.36 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1606 5.00 3.97 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1606 5.00 3.97 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1606 5.00 4.36 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1606 5.00 3.83  quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1  General 1 Under-grad 2  Electives 0 #### - Means there a	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1669 5.00 4.42 4.23 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.42 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 323/1617 4.67 4.29 4.15 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 4.67 4.15 4.06 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 4.67 4.15 4.06 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 4.15 4.06 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 4.68 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605 4.67 4.22 4.07  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 4.68 4.67 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 5.00 4.26 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 5.00 4.33 4.12 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 5.00 4.50 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 11551 5.00 4.66 4.39 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.66 4.39 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.50 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1503 5.00 4.50 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.67 4.15 3.85  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.36 4.26 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.36 4.26 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.36 4.26 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.83 4.00  Quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Major  General 1 Under-grad 2 Non- Electives 0 #### - Means there are not	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1669 5.00 4.42 4.23 4.35 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1666 5.00 4.33 4.19 4.19 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 323/1617 4.67 4.29 4.15 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 773/1555 4.00 4.26 4.00 4.07 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 250/1543 4.67 4.15 4.06 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1068/1668 4.67 4.15 4.06 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605 4.67 4.22 4.07 4.13  8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 239/1605 4.67 4.22 4.07 4.13  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1251 5.00 4.33 4.12 4.15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1251 5.00 4.33 4.12 4.15 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1251 5.00 4.36 4.67 4.83 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1251 5.00 4.66 4.39 4.37 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1251 5.00 4.66 4.39 4.37 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.66 4.39 4.37 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.50 4.24 4.22 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.67 4.15 3.85 3.89  1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.53 4.26 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.53 4.26 4.24 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1502 5.00 4.36 4.26 4.46 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1499 5.00 3.97 4.05 4.18 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1499 5.00 3.97 4.05 4.18 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1499 5.00 3.97 4.05 4.18 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.44 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.52 4.29 4.44 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1006 5.00 3.83 4.00 4.11  Quency Distribution  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Major  Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Major

Course Section: HIST 713 0101 University of Maryland COLLOQ: SOCIAL HIST Baltimore County

Title Fall 2006 SIMPSON, BRAD Instructor:

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1048

Student	Course	Evaluation	ı Quest:	ionnaire	
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------	--

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			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	3	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.42	4.23	4.35	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.33	4.19	4.19	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.29	4.15	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	611/1555	4.20	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.15	4.06	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1647	4.80	4.33	4.12	4.15	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.22	4.07	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.66	4.39	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.53	4.26	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	4.15	3.85	3.89	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	Λ	4	4.60	389/1490	4.60	3.97	4.05	4.18	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.36	4.26	4.16	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.52	4.29	4.44	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful		3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.83		4.11	
1. Were special ecommiques successful	0	3	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	1.50	2337 1000	1.50	3.03	1.00		1.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	48/ 112	4.75	4.88	4.38	4.39	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.80	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.36	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 105	4.75	3.75	4.20	4.23	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.00	3.95	3.93	4.00
Frequ	ency	n Dist	trib	utio	n									

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