

Course-Section: HIST 100 0101
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: FROIDE, AMY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 856
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	9	14	4.32	759/1481	4.40	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	632/1481	4.49	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	278/1249	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	13	10	4.14	863/1424	4.21	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	6	13	4.04	687/1396	4.09	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	8	11	4.04	737/1342	3.89	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	7	17	4.41	611/1459	4.33	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	21	4	4.12	1316/1480	4.52	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	12	10	4.28	599/1450	4.24	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	25	4.82	304/1409	4.81	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	614/1407	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	363/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	312/1400	4.72	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	4	2	5	5	8	3.46	919/1179	3.79	4.05	3.96	3.85	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	527/1262	3.84	4.14	4.05	3.77	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	708/1259	4.39	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	382/1256	4.62	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	564/ 788	3.63	3.95	4.00	3.80	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 29 Non-major 28
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 100 0201
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 857
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	870/1481	4.40	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	324/1481	4.49	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	278/1249	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	671/1424	4.21	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	519/1396	4.09	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	8	7	3.76	980/1342	3.89	4.21	4.07	3.88	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	961/1459	4.33	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.52	4.59	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	630/1450	4.24	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	400/1409	4.81	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1407	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	601/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	385/1400	4.72	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	434/1179	3.79	4.05	3.96	3.85	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	969/1262	3.84	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	588/1259	4.39	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	614/1256	4.62	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	3.63	3.95	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.14	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	13
				General	1
				Electives	0
				Other	8
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	22
				Major	5
				Non-major	17
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: HIST 100 0301
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 858
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	256/1481	4.40	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	493/1481	4.49	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	535/1249	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	3	2	7	7	3.95	1035/1424	4.21	4.36	4.21	4.06	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	3	5	9	3.86	839/1396	4.09	4.23	3.98	3.89	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	7	6	5	3.48	1130/1342	3.89	4.21	4.07	3.88	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	436/1459	4.33	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	351/1480	4.52	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	417/1450	4.24	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	169/1409	4.81	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	250/1407	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	502/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	274/1400	4.72	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	10	9	4.17	503/1179	3.79	4.05	3.96	3.85	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	995/1262	3.84	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	770/1259	4.39	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	527/1256	4.62	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	3.63	3.95	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 100 0401
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: HUDGINS, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 859
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	14	10	4.26	844/1481	4.40	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	736/1481	4.49	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	12	11	4.23	757/1249	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	509/1424	4.21	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	11	11	4.23	519/1396	4.09	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	9	12	4.27	534/1342	3.89	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	16	4.38	635/1459	4.33	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	18	4	4.00	1349/1480	4.52	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	836/1450	4.24	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	433/1409	4.81	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1407	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	4	18	4.48	590/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	21	4.63	468/1400	4.72	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	4	3	4	7	5	3.26	994/1179	3.79	4.05	3.96	3.85	3.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	4	11	3.96	752/1262	3.84	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	3	16	4.43	652/1259	4.39	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	428/1256	4.62	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	584/ 788	3.63	3.95	4.00	3.80	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 100H 0201
 Title WESTERN CIV--HONORS
 Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 860
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.14	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1199/1396	3.25	4.23	3.98	3.89	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	4.21	4.07	3.88	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.29	4.09	3.97	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1031/1409	4.25	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.05	3.96	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 101 0101
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: HAZELL, ERIC
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 861
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	25	4.63	439/1481	4.41	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	24	4.66	336/1481	4.42	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	196/1249	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.81		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	6	18	4.52	426/1424	4.29	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	8	16	4.30	459/1396	4.26	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	354/1342	4.24	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	7	20	4.45	535/1459	4.26	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19	11	4.37	1139/1480	4.41	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	127/1450	4.46	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	417/1409	4.51	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	636/1407	4.89	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	311/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	177/1400	4.73	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	23	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	705/1179	3.97	4.05	3.96	3.85	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	691/1262	3.81	4.14	4.05	3.77	4.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	777/1259	4.05	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	603/1256	4.35	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/ 788	2.50	3.95	4.00	3.80	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	10	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 101 0201
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: JOHNSON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 862
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.41	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.42	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	381/1249	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	959/1424	4.29	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	527/1396	4.26	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	755/1342	4.24	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1142/1459	4.26	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	951/1480	4.41	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	997/1450	4.46	4.29	4.09	3.97	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1222/1409	4.51	4.65	4.42	4.36	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	855/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	658/1400	4.73	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	877/1179	3.97	4.05	3.96	3.85	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	949/1262	3.81	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	992/1259	4.05	4.54	4.29	4.06	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	698/1256	4.35	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	3.95	4.00	3.80	2.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 101 0301
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 863
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	6	24	4.61	461/1481	4.41	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	24	4.62	386/1481	4.42	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	190/1249	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	3	8	19	4.34	633/1424	4.29	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	12	18	4.26	493/1396	4.26	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	12	16	4.27	527/1342	4.24	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	10	22	4.56	402/1459	4.26	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	25	8	4.21	1253/1480	4.41	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	217/1450	4.46	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	231/1409	4.51	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	350/1407	4.89	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	26	4.70	335/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	177/1400	4.73	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	291/1179	3.97	4.05	3.96	3.85	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	0	1	7	8	3.75	887/1262	3.81	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	4	4	10	4.00	895/1259	4.05	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	809/1256	4.35	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	14	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 788	2.50	3.95	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	3.67	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: HIST 101 0301
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 863
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	35	Non-major	33
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 102 0101
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 864
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	450/1481	4.06	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	725/1481	4.17	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	4	15	4.28	718/1249	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1202/1424	4.02	4.36	4.21	4.06	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	8	8	3.80	877/1396	3.91	4.23	3.98	3.89	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	649/1342	3.94	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	16	4.38	635/1459	4.32	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	18	4	3.96	1377/1480	4.33	4.59	4.68	4.64	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	732/1450	3.96	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	648/1409	4.43	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	636/1407	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	404/1399	4.41	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	361/1400	4.43	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	590/1179	3.93	4.05	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	556/1262	3.89	4.14	4.05	3.77	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	826/1259	4.16	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	704/1256	4.29	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 788	3.12	3.95	4.00	3.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 102 0201
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: JOHNSON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 865
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	6	7	4	3.43	1380/1481	4.06	4.44	4.29	4.14	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	7	6	3.67	1253/1481	4.17	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	2	13	4.20	788/1249	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	6	5	7	3.75	1186/1424	4.02	4.36	4.21	4.06	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	8	9	4.10	649/1396	3.91	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	7	1	4	3.00	1269/1342	3.94	4.21	4.07	3.88	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	3	3	10	3.67	1201/1459	4.32	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	1011/1480	4.33	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	3	11	0	3.41	1262/1450	3.96	4.29	4.09	3.97	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	6	5	6	3.74	1256/1409	4.43	4.65	4.42	4.36	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	941/1407	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	1100/1399	4.41	4.52	4.26	4.23	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	6	8	4.00	1017/1400	4.43	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	860/1179	3.93	4.05	3.96	3.85	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	953/1262	3.89	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	961/1259	4.16	4.54	4.29	4.06	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	901/1256	4.29	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	731/ 788	3.12	3.95	4.00	3.80	2.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 102 0301
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: SIMPSON, BRAD
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 866
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1380/1481	4.06	4.44	4.29	4.14	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1264/1481	4.17	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	962/1249	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.14	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	1239/1424	4.02	4.36	4.21	4.06	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	965/1396	3.91	4.23	3.98	3.89	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1101/1342	3.94	4.21	4.07	3.88	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	792/1459	4.32	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1178/1480	4.33	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	6	0	3.33	1285/1450	3.96	4.29	4.09	3.97	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	1055/1409	4.43	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1053/1407	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	929/1399	4.41	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1130/1400	4.43	4.51	4.27	4.19	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	352/1179	3.93	4.05	3.96	3.85	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	958/1262	3.89	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	751/1259	4.16	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	742/1256	4.29	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	2	2	5	0	3.33	671/ 788	3.12	3.95	4.00	3.80	3.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 102 0401
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: HAZELL, ERIC
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 867
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	12	15	4.38	708/1481	4.06	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	17	4.55	458/1481	4.17	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	228/1249	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	497/1424	4.02	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	13	10	4.07	662/1396	3.91	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	424/1342	3.94	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	448/1459	4.32	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	16	12	4.43	1100/1480	4.33	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	10	14	4.48	361/1450	3.96	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	529/1409	4.43	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	591/1407	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	390/1399	4.41	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	25	4.76	312/1400	4.43	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	19	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	590/1179	3.93	4.05	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	691/1262	3.89	4.14	4.05	3.77	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	803/1259	4.16	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	571/1256	4.29	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	11	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/ 788	3.12	3.95	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.54	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.48	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 9	Required for Majors 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 11	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 7	General 7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 28
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 4
					Other 8
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 102 0501
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: FISCHER, LAWREN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 868
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	613/1481	4.06	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	361/1481	4.17	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	561/1249	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	395/1424	4.02	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	801/1396	3.91	4.23	3.98	3.89	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	214/1342	3.94	4.21	4.07	3.88	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1459	4.32	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1139/1480	4.33	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	417/1450	3.96	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	188/1409	4.43	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.77	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	300/1399	4.41	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	146/1400	4.43	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	840/1179	3.93	4.05	3.96	3.85	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1262	3.89	4.14	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1259	4.16	4.54	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	4.29	4.65	4.30	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 102H 0301
 Title US SINCE 1877-HONORS
 Instructor: SIMPSON, BRAD
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 869
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.49	4.27	4.14	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.36	4.21	4.06	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.23	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	4.21	4.07	3.88	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.29	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1221/1407	4.33	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1196/1399	3.67	4.52	4.26	4.23	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1183/1400	3.67	4.51	4.27	4.19	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.05	3.96	3.85	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.95	4.00	3.80	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 103 0101
 Title EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO
 Instructor: INGEMAN, LARA
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 870
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	8	13	4.07	1031/1481	4.07	4.44	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	6	14	3.87	1142/1481	3.87	4.38	4.23	4.18	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	9	10	3.73	1056/1249	3.73	4.49	4.27	4.14	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	7	13	3.97	1010/1424	3.97	4.36	4.21	4.06	3.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	8	8	8	3.57	1048/1396	3.57	4.23	3.98	3.89	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	7	9	9	3.63	1055/1342	3.63	4.21	4.07	3.88	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	8	14	4.13	881/1459	4.13	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	28	1	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.59	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	8	12	2	3.58	1195/1450	3.58	4.29	4.09	3.97	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	693/1409	4.56	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	1091/1407	4.52	4.88	4.69	4.57	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	723/1399	4.36	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	3	1	2	5	11	3.91	692/1179	3.91	4.05	3.96	3.85	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1018/1262	3.44	4.14	4.05	3.77	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.54	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.65	4.30	4.08	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	3.80	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	3.44	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 201 0101
 Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST
 Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 871
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	15	16	4.13	986/1481	4.13	4.44	4.29	4.40	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	29	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.38	4.23	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	28	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	369/1249	4.64	4.49	4.27	4.36	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	2	13	19	4.27	717/1424	4.27	4.36	4.21	4.28	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	6	5	21	4.03	694/1396	4.03	4.23	3.98	3.94	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	6	25	4.45	364/1342	4.45	4.21	4.07	4.05	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	6	27	4.53	436/1459	4.53	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	34	4.87	756/1480	4.87	4.59	4.68	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	10	17	4.52	326/1450	4.52	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	32	4.82	304/1409	4.82	4.65	4.42	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	36	4.90	522/1407	4.90	4.88	4.69	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	30	4.79	234/1399	4.79	4.52	4.26	4.29	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	6	27	4.49	613/1400	4.49	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	6	7	23	4.23	457/1179	4.23	4.05	3.96	4.05	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	5	6	19	4.15	645/1262	4.15	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	6	24	4.59	524/1259	4.59	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	3	28	4.74	382/1256	4.74	4.65	4.30	4.28	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	1	6	3	16	4.07	377/ 788	4.07	3.95	4.00	3.98	4.07	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 246	****	3.67	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HIST 201 0101
 Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST
 Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 871
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 201H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 872
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.44	4.29	4.40	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.38	4.23	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1249	****	4.49	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.36	4.21	4.28	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1188/1396	3.29	4.23	3.98	3.94	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	153/1342	4.71	4.21	4.07	4.05	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.59	4.68	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	281/1450	4.57	4.29	4.09	4.15	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.52	4.26	4.29	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	152/1179	4.71	4.05	3.96	4.05	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	645/1262	4.14	4.14	4.05	4.11	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.65	4.30	4.28	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	278/ 788	4.29	3.95	4.00	3.98	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 303 0101
 Title SECOND WORLD WAR
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 106
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 873
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	12	53	4.74	316/1481	4.74	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	19	49	4.72	255/1481	4.72	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	11	53	4.75	253/1249	4.75	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	2	9	16	38	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	7	22	36	4.37	403/1396	4.37	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	4	8	21	31	4.18	603/1342	4.18	4.21	4.07	4.12	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	15	51	4.75	203/1459	4.75	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	63	4.95	351/1480	4.95	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	11	42	4.79	144/1450	4.79	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	7	59	4.89	202/1409	4.89	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	65	4.98	100/1407	4.98	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	10	55	4.82	203/1399	4.82	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	7	59	4.89	156/1400	4.89	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	2	7	20	34	4.37	365/1179	4.37	4.05	3.96	4.02	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	2	2	3	12	17	4.11	666/1262	4.11	4.14	4.05	4.14	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	3	2	8	23	4.42	670/1259	4.42	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	1	0	1	5	29	4.69	428/1256	4.69	4.65	4.30	4.34	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	35	22	4	0	1	1	7	3.54	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	3.67	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: HIST 303 0101
 Title SECOND WORLD WAR
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 106
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 873
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	28	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	9	C	4	General	26	Under-grad	70	Non-major	42
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 355A 0101
 Title HIST OF AMER INTELLIGE
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 874
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	31	4.71	352/1481	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	29	4.56	446/1481	4.56	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	29	4.61	405/1249	4.61	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	9	24	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	9	26	4.44	355/1396	4.44	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	11	22	4.29	511/1342	4.29	4.21	4.07	4.12	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	6	32	4.75	196/1459	4.75	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	37	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	9	25	4.54	304/1450	4.54	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	32	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	38	4.95	300/1407	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	7	28	4.55	513/1399	4.55	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	36	4.82	229/1400	4.82	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	7	9	20	4.27	426/1179	4.27	4.05	3.96	4.02	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	0	2	3	10	3.94	761/1262	3.94	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	770/1259	4.28	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.28	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	692/1256	4.39	4.65	4.30	4.34	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	13	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 1 Major 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 7	C 2	General 20	Under-grad 40 Non-major 25
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 369 0101
 Title DARWINISM
 Instructor: HERBERT, SANDRA
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 875
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	12	18	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	8	17	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	184/1249	4.83	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	509/1424	4.44	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	9	17	4.41	371/1396	4.41	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.21	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	9	18	4.52	448/1459	4.52	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	18	10	4.31	1171/1480	4.31	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	15	9	4.27	620/1450	4.27	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	188/1409	4.90	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	350/1407	4.93	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	262/1400	4.79	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	7	11	7	3.85	726/1179	3.85	4.05	3.96	4.02	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	965/1262	3.59	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	572/1259	4.53	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	232/1256	4.88	4.65	4.30	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 7	C 0	General	11
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 369H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HERBERT, SANDRA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 876
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	502/1396	4.25	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.21	4.07	4.12	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.50	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.05	3.96	4.02	4.50	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.14	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.95	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 371 0101
 Title HISTORY AND FILM
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 877
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	10	12	4.32	759/1481	4.32	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	5	12	4.12	942/1481	4.12	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	718/1249	4.29	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	595/1424	4.38	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	7	14	4.32	443/1396	4.32	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	3	14	4.08	707/1342	4.08	4.21	4.07	4.12	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	8	2	13	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	281/1480	4.96	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	13	8	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	523/1399	4.54	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4	18	4.54	551/1400	4.54	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	182/1179	4.65	4.05	3.96	4.02	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.14	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.65	4.30	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	2
			P 2		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 375 0101
 Title EUR WOMN HIST 1750-191
 Instructor: HUDGINS, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 878
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	938/1481	4.18	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	900/1481	4.18	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	695/1249	4.31	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	896/1424	4.12	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	10	4.06	675/1396	4.06	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	941/1342	3.82	4.21	4.07	4.12	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	5	8	4.06	935/1459	4.06	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	12	4	4.18	1274/1480	4.18	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1005/1450	3.87	4.29	4.09	4.10	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	1	11	4.31	773/1399	4.31	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	961/1400	4.13	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	495/1179	4.19	4.05	3.96	4.02	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	10	4.29	543/1262	4.29	4.14	4.05	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	413/1259	4.71	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	419/1256	4.71	4.65	4.30	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	270/ 788	4.30	3.95	4.00	4.07	4.30	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	

Course-Section: HIST 375 0101
 Title EUR WOMN HIST 1750-191
 Instructor: HUDGINS, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 878
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 380 0101
 Title WOMEN/GENDER IN ASIA
 Instructor: INGEMAN, LARA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 879
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	7	14	4.15	967/1481	4.15	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	8	9	3.81	1172/1481	3.81	4.38	4.23	4.23	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	3	9	12	4.19	788/1249	4.19	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	9	11	4.12	896/1424	4.12	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	7	13	4.19	564/1396	4.19	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	9	5	12	4.04	737/1342	4.04	4.21	4.07	4.12	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	4	5	13	3.96	995/1459	3.96	4.30	4.16	4.17	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	19	6	4.15	1288/1480	4.15	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	6	11	3	3.64	1174/1450	3.64	4.29	4.09	4.10	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	3	4	13	4.17	1080/1409	4.17	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	938/1399	4.13	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	7	12	4.26	859/1400	4.26	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	3	2	6	12	4.17	503/1179	4.17	4.05	3.96	4.02	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	5	6	5	3.63	944/1262	3.63	4.14	4.05	4.14	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	3	2	11	4.11	867/1259	4.11	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	735/1256	4.32	4.65	4.30	4.34	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	640/ 788	3.43	3.95	4.00	4.07	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	3.67	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: HIST 380 0101
 Title WOMEN/GENDER IN ASIA
 Instructor: INGEMAN, LARA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 879
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	28	Non-major	23
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 387 0101
 Title MED/HEALTH CARE IN CHI
 Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 880
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	316/1481	4.73	4.44	4.29	4.29	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	481/1481	4.54	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	298/1249	4.69	4.49	4.27	4.28	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	193/1424	4.79	4.36	4.21	4.27	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	9	9	3.88	816/1396	3.88	4.23	3.98	4.00	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	264/1342	4.56	4.21	4.07	4.12	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.30	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	18	4	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.59	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	483/1450	4.39	4.29	4.09	4.10	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	75/1409	4.96	4.65	4.42	4.43	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	117/1400	4.92	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	2	3	13	4.25	442/1179	4.25	4.05	3.96	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	381/1262	4.46	4.14	4.05	4.14	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1259	4.69	4.54	4.29	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	428/1256	4.69	4.65	4.30	4.34	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 26 Non-major 19
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 443 0101
 Title THE U.S. SINCE 1945
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 881
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	30	4.82	218/1481	4.82	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	25	4.63	374/1481	4.63	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	5	24	4.58	432/1249	4.58	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	7	3	22	4.47	485/1424	4.47	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	8	21	4.47	321/1396	4.47	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	7	7	19	4.26	534/1342	4.26	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	26	4.65	298/1459	4.65	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	24	9	4.24	1230/1480	4.24	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	154/1450	4.77	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	367/1409	4.78	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	350/1407	4.94	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	363/1399	4.68	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	239/1400	4.81	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	3	3	4	15	4.12	549/1179	4.12	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	1	3	14	4.45	400/1262	4.45	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	461/1259	4.65	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	15	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 22
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 35 Non-major 13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 446 0101
 Title HIST OF SCI SINCE 1700
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 882
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1226/1481	3.71	4.38	4.23	4.32	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	865/1249	4.08	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.36	4.21	4.35	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	998/1396	3.64	4.23	3.98	4.09	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1071/1342	3.60	4.21	4.07	4.21	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	5	3	2	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.30	4.16	4.25	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1046/1450	3.82	4.29	4.09	4.28	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	913/1409	4.38	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	930/1407	4.69	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	920/1399	4.15	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	994/1400	4.08	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	352/1179	4.38	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.14	4.05	4.33	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	1086/1259	3.56	4.54	4.29	4.57	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	992/1256	3.89	4.65	4.30	4.60	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 446H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 883
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.38	4.23	4.32	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1147/1249	3.33	4.49	4.27	4.44	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.36	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1435/1459	2.33	4.30	4.16	4.25	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1285/1450	3.33	4.29	4.09	4.28	3.33	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1183/1400	3.67	4.51	4.27	4.38	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.67	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	4.14	4.05	4.33	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1259	3.67	4.54	4.29	4.57	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 453 0101
 Title ANCIENT GREECE
 Instructor: STORCH, RUDOLPH
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 884
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	428/1481	4.63	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	23	4.63	361/1481	4.63	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	22	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	7	16	4.34	427/1396	4.34	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.21	4.07	4.21	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	26	4.77	189/1459	4.77	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	400/1409	4.77	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	200/1407	4.97	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	2	22	4.47	613/1399	4.47	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	23	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	5	8	14	4.21	472/1179	4.21	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/1262	****	4.14	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/1259	****	4.54	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	****/1256	****	4.65	4.30	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	4
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 457 0101
 Title: BYZANTINE CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 885
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	11	15	4.44	603/1481	4.44	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	196/1249	4.81	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	569/1424	4.39	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	246/1396	4.59	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	7	6	12	4.20	592/1342	4.20	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	4	17	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	483/1450	4.39	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	513/1399	4.56	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	324/1400	4.74	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	2	1	3	19	4.42	323/1179	4.42	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	638/1262	4.16	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	264/1256	4.84	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	278/ 788	4.29	3.95	4.00	4.26	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 2		

Course-Section: HIST 466 0101
 Title THE REFORMATION
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 886
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	225/1481	4.81	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	237/1481	4.74	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	261/1249	4.73	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	263/1424	4.69	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	65/1396	4.93	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	158/1342	4.70	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	448/1459	4.52	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	89/1450	4.92	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	150/1409	4.93	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	200/1407	4.96	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	178/1399	4.85	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	117/1400	4.93	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	233/1179	4.56	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	279/1262	4.64	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	248/1259	4.86	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	604/788	3.50	3.95	4.00	4.26	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 17		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: HIST 472 0101
 Title VICTORIAN BRITAIN
 Instructor: RITSCHHEL, DANIE
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 887
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	792/1481	4.29	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	979/1481	4.06	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	863/1424	4.14	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	285/1396	4.53	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	534/1342	4.27	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	671/1459	4.35	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	792/1450	4.08	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	588/1409	4.65	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	404/1399	4.65	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	624/1400	4.47	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	6	3	6	3.76	786/1179	3.76	4.05	3.96	4.07	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 472H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: RITSCHHEL, DANIE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 888
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	435/1396	4.33	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	840/1179	3.67	4.05	3.96	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.95	4.00	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 480 0101
 Title CONTEMP CHINA SINCE 19
 Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 889
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	3	9	18	4.39	698/1481	4.39	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	10	19	4.52	505/1481	4.52	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	381/1249	4.62	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	473/1424	4.47	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	12	14	4.23	527/1396	4.23	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	231/1459	4.71	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	24	7	4.23	1238/1480	4.23	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	0	8	14	4.42	459/1450	4.42	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	4	2	7	4	3	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	4.05	3.96	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	3	6	8	3.85	829/1262	3.85	4.14	4.05	4.33	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	715/1259	4.35	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	3.67	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	5.00	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	5.00	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HIST 480 0101
 Title CONTEMP CHINA SINCE 19
 Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 889
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	33	Non-major	8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	1193/1481	3.86	4.44	4.29	4.45	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1280/1481	3.62	4.38	4.23	4.32	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1123/1424	3.86	4.36	4.21	4.35	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	1	10	4.14	603/1396	4.14	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	3	5	3.43	1155/1342	3.43	4.21	4.07	4.21	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1030/1459	3.93	4.30	4.16	4.25	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1055/1450	3.80	4.29	4.09	4.28	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	0	1	4	4	3.50	1293/1409	3.50	4.65	4.42	4.51	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1137/1407	4.46	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	1130/1399	3.83	4.52	4.26	4.36	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	1209/1400	3.58	4.51	4.27	4.38	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	786/1179	3.77	4.05	3.96	4.07	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	457/1262	4.38	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	499/1259	4.62	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	554/1256	4.54	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	3	1	0	4	3	3.27	686/ 788	3.27	3.95	4.00	4.26	3.27	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	****	3.67	4.11	3.87	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	54/ 68	4.00	4.31	4.49	4.68	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	36/ 69	4.50	4.63	4.53	4.64	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	61/ 63	3.25	4.19	4.44	4.49	3.25	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	62/ 69	3.25	3.88	4.35	4.53	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	53/ 68	3.25	4.00	3.92	4.10	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	4.00	4.56	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.67	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	5.00	4.65	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7

Course-Section: HIST 486 0101
 Title SOVIET HISTORY ON TRIA
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 891
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	268/1481	4.77	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	854/1481	4.23	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	703/1249	4.30	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	11	9	4.23	773/1424	4.23	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	444/1342	4.36	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	4	3	10	3.77	1142/1459	3.77	4.30	4.16	4.25	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1025/1480	4.55	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	567/1450	4.31	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	246/1409	4.86	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	250/1407	4.95	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	245/1399	4.77	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	299/1400	4.76	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	3	7	9	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	887/1262	3.75	4.14	4.05	4.33	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	276/1259	4.83	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	527/1256	4.58	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	201/ 788	4.44	3.95	4.00	4.26	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 23 Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 2		

Course-Section: HIST 486H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 892
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	380/1396	4.40	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	405/1342	4.40	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	997/1480	4.60	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	340/1179	4.40	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.14	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.95	4.00	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495A 0101
 Title EARLY BALTIMORE
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 893
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	693/1481	4.38	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	318/1424	4.63	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	823/1396	3.88	4.23	3.98	4.09	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1342	4.75	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.29	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	760/1179	3.80	4.05	3.96	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.95	4.00	4.26	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	49/ 68	4.25	4.31	4.49	4.68	4.25	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	36/ 69	4.50	4.63	4.53	4.64	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	31/ 63	4.50	4.19	4.44	4.49	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	42/ 69	4.25	3.88	4.35	4.53	4.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	33/ 68	4.25	4.00	3.92	4.10	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495C 0101
 Title HISTORY, SCIENCE & MUSEUM
 Instructor: BEDI, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 894
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.36	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.23	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.21	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.30	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.52	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.14	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.95	4.00	4.26	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 496 0101
 Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 Instructor: SIMPSON, BRAD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 895
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	176/1481	4.82	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.49	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	649/1396	4.09	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	148/1342	4.73	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	732/1459	4.30	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	1457/1480	3.45	4.59	4.68	4.74	3.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	705/1409	4.56	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	636/1399	4.44	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	977/1400	4.11	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.05	3.96	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	3.95	4.00	4.26	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1481	4.92	4.44	4.29	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1249	****	4.49	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	263/1424	4.69	4.36	4.21	4.35	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	594/1396	4.15	4.23	3.98	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	101/1342	4.85	4.21	4.07	4.21	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	189/1459	4.77	4.30	4.16	4.25	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1480	4.69	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	238/1450	4.64	4.29	4.09	4.28	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	319/1409	4.82	4.65	4.42	4.51	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.88	4.69	4.79	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	203/1399	4.82	4.52	4.26	4.36	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	754/1400	4.36	4.51	4.27	4.38	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.05	3.96	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	325/1262	4.55	4.14	4.05	4.33	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	391/1259	4.73	4.54	4.29	4.57	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	216/1256	4.91	4.65	4.30	4.60	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	3.95	4.00	4.26	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 666 0101
 Title THE REFORMATION
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 897
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.44	4.29	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.38	4.23	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.49	4.27	4.24	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.80	4.36	4.21	4.16	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1396	4.80	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	4.21	4.07	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	611/1459	4.40	4.30	4.16	4.01	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.29	4.09	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.52	4.26	4.16	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.51	4.27	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	487/1179	4.20	4.05	3.96	3.81	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.14	4.05	4.07	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788	4.75	3.95	4.00	3.97	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	202/ 246	3.67	3.67	4.20	4.27	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	189/ 249	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.93	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.15	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.73	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.31	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.63	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.19	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	3.88	4.35	4.16	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.00	3.92	3.71	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	39/ 59	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.01	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	11/ 51	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.81	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.65	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.27	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	48/ 55	3.67	3.67	4.55	4.38	3.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Course-Section: HIST 666 0101
 Title THE REFORMATION
 Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 897
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 672 0101
 Title VICTORIAN BRITAIN
 Instructor: RITSCHHEL, DANIE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 898
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.44	4.29	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.38	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.36	4.21	4.16	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	934/1342	3.83	4.21	4.07	4.18	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.30	4.16	4.01	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1030/1450	3.83	4.29	4.09	3.96	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.52	4.26	4.16	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	4.05	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	842/1262	3.83	4.14	4.05	4.07	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1027/1259	3.80	4.54	4.29	4.30	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1012/1256	3.83	4.65	4.30	4.33	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	3.95	4.00	3.97	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	54/ 68	4.00	4.31	4.49	4.23	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	4.50	4.63	4.53	4.46	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	45/ 63	4.00	4.19	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	66/ 69	3.00	3.88	4.35	4.16	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	47/ 68	3.50	4.00	3.92	3.71	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 680 0101
 Title CONTEMP CHINA SINCE 19
 Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 899
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.38	4.23	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.49	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.36	4.21	4.16	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.21	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.30	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.29	4.09	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.52	4.26	4.16	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1177/1179	1.00	4.05	3.96	3.81	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.14	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	781/ 788	2.00	3.95	4.00	3.97	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 684 0101
 Title GERMAN HIST 1914-PRESE
 Instructor: HUDGINS, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 900
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.36	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.23	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.21	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.30	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.29	4.09	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.52	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.05	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.14	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.95	4.00	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 702 0101
 Title U.S. HISTORIOGRAPHY
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 901
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.44	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.38	4.23	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.49	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.36	4.21	4.16	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	592/1342	4.20	4.21	4.07	4.18	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	854/1459	4.17	4.30	4.16	4.01	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.29	4.09	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	683/1399	4.40	4.52	4.26	4.16	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1144/1179	2.33	4.05	3.96	3.81	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.14	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.95	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 705 0101
 Title INTRO PUBLIC HIST
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 902
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.38	4.23	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.36	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.23	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.21	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.30	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.29	4.09	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.65	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.52	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.05	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.14	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.54	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.65	4.30	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 711 0101
 Title COLLOQUIUM: AMER HISTO
 Instructor: PERI, MARCIA F
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 903
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	626/1481	4.44	4.44	4.29	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	854/1481	4.22	4.38	4.23	4.11	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.49	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.36	4.21	4.16	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	527/1396	4.22	4.23	3.98	4.00	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.21	4.07	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	800/1459	4.22	4.30	4.16	4.01	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.59	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1329/1450	3.17	4.29	4.09	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1049/1409	4.22	4.65	4.42	4.36	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	785/1407	4.78	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	855/1399	4.22	4.52	4.26	4.16	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	977/1400	4.11	4.51	4.27	4.17	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	840/1179	3.67	4.05	3.96	3.81	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.14	4.05	4.07	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	643/1259	4.44	4.54	4.29	4.30	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	636/1256	4.44	4.65	4.30	4.33	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	533/ 788	3.75	3.95	4.00	3.97	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.31	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.63	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.19	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.88	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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