Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18

Instructor:

Enrollment: 74 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2007 JOHNSON, MICHAE

Page 937 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did voi	u gain new	insights,skil		his course	0	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1352/	1639	3.77	4.41	4.27	4.08	3.77
_	_	or make clear			0	0	1	0	5	4	3		1438/		3.62	4.26	4.22	4.17	3.62
		estions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	1	3	5	4		1063/		3.92	4.38	4.28	4.18	3.92
	_	tions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	1	4	2	6		1010/		4.00	4.28	4.19		4.00
		dings contribu			0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85			3.85	4.35	4.01	3.88	3.85
				hat you learned	0	0	0	2	4	4	3		1147/		3.62	4.21	4.05	3.78	3.62
		system clearly			0	1	1	1	2	4	-		1279/		3.75	4.35	4.16	4.10	3.75
		as class cance		a	0	0	0	0	2	10			1554/		3.92	4.62	4.65	4.56	3.92
				g effectiveness	4	0	0	3	4	2			1515/		2.89	4.25		3.95	
9. HOW WO	uia you gi	ade the overal	i teachin	g effectiveness	4	U	U	3	4	۷	U	2.09	1515/.	15/9	2.09	4.25	4.00	3.95	2.09
		Lecture	5																
1. Were th	he instruc	ctor's lectures	well pre	pared	1	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1392/	1518	3.67	4.60	4.43	4.38	3.67
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem intere	sted in t	he subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1033/	1520	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.67
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presented	d and expl	ained clearly	1	0	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	1380/	1517	3.42	4.44	4.27	4.20	3.42
		contribute to			1	0	1	2	3	1	5		1303/		3.58	4.42	4.22	4.17	3.58
				understanding	1	0	1	1	3	4			938/					3.84	
J. Dia au	alovibaai	ccciniiques em	idiice your	anacistanaing	_	O	_	_	3	-	5	3.30	2307.	12/5	3.30	1.10	3.71	3.01	3.30
		Discuss	_																
		ssions contribu		6	0	2	0	1	1	3		1150/		3.43	3.96	4.07	3.85	3.43	
2. Were a	ll student	o participate	6	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1163/	1391	3.71	4.30	4.30	4.07	3.71		
3. Did the	e instruct	pen discussion	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1108/	1388	3.71	4.40	4.28	4.01	3.71		
4. Were sp	the instructor encourage fair and open discus e special techniques successful					4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/	958	****	3.87	3.93	3.71	****
		Laborat	orv																
2. Were yo	ou provide		-	und information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
_	_	_	_																
		Seminar					_												
		pics relevant			12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/	85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
				dual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	82	****	4.83	4.52	4.12	****
	_	jects contribu		-	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
_		ıs contribute t	_	u learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	80	****	4.90	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	82	***	4.58	4.16	3.90	****
		Field W	Jork																
1. Did fie	eld experi	ence contribut		you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	52	****	1.00	4.04	3.61	****
	-																		
				Frequ	uency	Dist	trib	utio:	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5				ed f				7	Grad	 duate		0	Majo		2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	А 5 В 3		Kec	quir	eu I	OT I₄Iç	ווטנג	5	,	Grad	uuat	=	J	Ma JC	) I	4
28-55 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	В 3 С 1		000	nera	1				0	77~ ~ <sup>2</sup>	020.00	rad 1	.3	Mos	-ma = a==	11
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Gel	net d	т.				U	ona	er-gi	Lau I	د.	14011-	-major	тТ
	0		0	Б 0 F 0		TO 7	0 a t -	***				1	щщи.	ш "	Moona +	homo -			.h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	U			E16	ecti	ves				Τ.			Means t			_	İTT
						<u> </u>	1					0	res	house	es to b	e sigr	ıııcar	IL	
				I 0		Oti	her					2							
				? 0															

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 19

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 938 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

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

		General	l																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil	lls from	this course	1	0	2	1	3	9	3	3.56	1475/	1639	4.14	4.41	4.27	4.08	3.56
2. Did th	ne instruct	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	1	0	1	2	7	5	3	3.39	1526/	1639	4.15	4.26	4.22	4.17	3.39
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	2	0	7	6	3	3.44	1287/	1397	4.21	4.38	4.28	4.18	3.44
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	1	3	0	4	5	5	3.53	1398/	1583	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.01	3.53
			_	hat you learned	1	0	2	2	0	10	4	3.67	1136/	1532	4.23	4.35	4.01	3.88	3.67
	-	-		what you learned	1	2	2	0	1	7	6	3.94	908/		4.17	4.21	4.05	3.78	3.94
		system clearly		_	1	0	2	2	2	5	7		1294/		4.29	4.35	4.16	4.10	3.72
		was class cance		iica	1	1	0	0	0	1	16		397/		4.54	4.62	4.65	4.56	4.94
				ing effectiveness	4	0	2	1	3	7	2		1364/			4.25	4.08		3.40
J. HOW WO	outa you g.	rade the overa.	II teacii	ing effectiveness	7	U	2		3	,	2	3.40	1304/.	13/3	4.07	4.23	4.00	3.93	3.40
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures		repared	3	0	1	1	5	2	7	3.81	1347/	1518	4.43	4.60	4.43	4.38	3.81
		tor seem inter	_	-	2	0	1	0	1	3			1213/		4.77	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.47
				plained clearly	2	0	2	1	5	5	4		1358/		4.25	4.44	4.27	4.20	3.47
		s contribute to			2	1	3	2	2	5	_		1390/		4.22	4.42	4.22		3.31
			_															4.17	
5. Did au	alovisual	techniques en	nance yo	ur understanding	2	0	1	1	4	2	9	4.00	623/	1295	4.09	4.16	3.94	3.84	4.00
		Discus	ai on																
1 Did al	acc dican			hat you learned	9	0	4	3	2	1	0	2 00	1384/	1200	3.15	3.96	4.07	3.85	2.00
				to participate	9	0	3	1	2	0	4		1304/		3.59	4.30	4.30	4.07	3.10
		_	_				2	2	1	3									
		_		open discussion	9	0	2	0			2		1307/		3.97	4.40	4.28	4.01	3.10
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssiul		9	7	2	U	1	0	0	1.67	****/	958	4.06	3.87	3.93	3.71	****
		Laborat	orv																
2 Were v	zou provid		-	round information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/	240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
_	_	_	_	r lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
	_	tructor provide			18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/		****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
		_		ance arly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
5. were r	requiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cie	ariy specified	18	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	***/	198	* * * *	5.00	4.18	4.25	
		Semina	c																
1. Were a	ssigned to			announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
	-	_		vidual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	82	****	4.83	4.52	4.12	****
				hat you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
	_	ns contribute (		_	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	80	****	4.90	4.47	4.39	****
_		or grading made		you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	4.58	4.47	3.90	****
5. were c	eriteria i	or grading made	e clear		18	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	***/	82	* * * *	4.58	4.10	3.90	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1										
				-	-														
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	son	S				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	8	Grad	duate		0	Majo	r	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			_						_		_	_			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 6		Ger	neral	L				4	Und	er-gr	ad 1	9	Non-	major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0						enoug	h
				P 0									res	ponse	s to b	e sign	ifican	t	
				I 0		Oth	ner					4							
				? 0															

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 43

Questionnaires: 38

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 939 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	naia	c		Inat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMDC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	MΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	12	25	4.63	469/1639		4.41	4.27	4.08	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	26	4.62	393/1639	4.15	4.26	4.22	4.17	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	7	29	4.63	392/1397	4.21	4.38	4.28	4.18	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	761/1583	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	28	4.50	335/1532		4.35	4.01	3.88	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	26	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	478/1504		4.21	4.05	3.78	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	29	4.61	388/1612		4.35	4.16	4.10	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	8	27	0		1592/1635	4.54	4.62	4.65	4.56	3.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	8	17	4.40	496/1579	4.07	4.25	4.08	3.95	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	7	27	4.67	602/1518	4.43	4.60	4.43	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	648/1520	4.77	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	26	4.65	428/1517	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	4	31	4.73	388/1550	4.22	4.42	4.22	4.17	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	9	10	10	3.93	698/1295	4.09	4.16	3.94	3.84	3.93
_, ,														
Discussion				_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	3	3	3	-7		1192/1398		3.96	4.07	3.85	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	3	6	3	6		1247/1391	3.59	4.30	4.30	4.07	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	854/1388		4.40	4.28	4.01	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	17	15	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 958	4.06	3.87	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
·														

Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 38

AD, HOWARD Fall 2007

Page 939 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	A	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 102 0301 University of Maryland Baltimore County AMER HIST SINCE 1877

Title Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 27

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49 2

3.50-4.00 0

D 0 F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 940 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	3	2	8	14	4.22	919/1639	4.14	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.22
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	617/1639	4.15	4.26	4.22	4.17	4.44
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	467/1397	4.21	4.38	4.28	4.18	4.56
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	548/1583	4.09	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.44
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	329/1532	4.23	4.35	4.01	3.88	4.52
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	11	11	4.15	724/1504	4.17	4.21	4.05	3.78	4.15
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	439/1612	4.29	4.35	4.16	4.10	4.56
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	265/1635	4.54	4.62	4.65	4.56	4.96
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	496/1579	4.07	4.25	4.08	3.95	4.41
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	345/1518	4.43	4.60	4.43	4.38	4.81
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	219/1520	4.77	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.96
3. Was le	ecture ma	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	451/1517	4.25	4.44	4.27	4.20	4.63		
4. Did th	ne lectur	you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	21	4.63	500/1550	4.22	4.42	4.22	4.17	4.63		
5. Did av	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	391/1295	4.09	4.16	3.94	3.84	4.35
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	702/1398		3.96	4.07	3.85	4.16
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	808/1391		4.30	4.30	4.07	4.26
		_		nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	593/1388		4.40	4.28	4.01	
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		8	1	0	2	4	3	9	4.06	446/ 958	4.06	3.87	3.93	3.71	4.06
		Labora	-															
			_		25 25	1 0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 224		****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were y	Did the lab increase understanding of the material Were you provided with adequate background informations						0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	 A 7		Red	auir	ed f	 วะ M	 aior	 s 1	 5	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		1000	2411	ca I	J. 11	<u>ـ ۲</u>	~ 1		Gradad	~	-	114		_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad ?	27	Non-	-major	26
04 150	0	2.00-2.33		C 2		Gei	iicia	_				_	onder g	144 2	. ,	14011	ilia jui	20

Electives

Other

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO

Title

Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA

Enrollment: 77 Questionnaires: 42

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 941 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General					_	_			=== /4 <==					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	9	9	24	4.36	797/1639	4.36	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	10	25	4.43	650/1639	4.43	4.26	4.22	4.17	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0 1	8 7	8 18	26 16	4.43 4.17	632/1397	4.43	4.38	4.28	4.18 4.01	4.43 4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	18	21	4.17	881/1583 419/1532	4.17 4.43	4.28	4.19 4.01	3.88	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3 7	18	16	4.14	724/1504	4.14	4.21	4.01	3.78	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	7	28	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.35	4.16	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	3	37	4.81	811/1635	4.81	4.62	4.65	4.56	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	2	5	13	12	4.09	835/1579	4.09	4.25	4.08	3.95	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	31	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.60	4.43	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	35	4.79	837/1520	4.79	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	10	27	4.45	661/1517	4.45	4.44	4.27	4.20	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	12	25	4.44	729/1550	4.44	4.42	4.22	4.17	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	3	11	23	4.30	421/1295	4.30	4.16	3.94	3.84	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	10	13	7	3.73	987/1398	3.73	3.96	4.07	3.85	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	9	11	10		1118/1391	3.82	4.30	4.30	4.07	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	9	11	12	4.03	936/1388	4.03	4.40	4.28	4.01	4.03
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	2	3	8	9	6	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.87	3.93	3.71	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	2	0	2	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	2	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	2	0	0	1	2	0	J . J .	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	3	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	2	0	0	1	2	0	J . J .	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.30	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO

Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA

Enrollment: 77
Questionnaires: 42

77

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 941 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	 А	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	7	Under-grad	42	Non-major	25
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Title WESTERN CIV TO 1700

Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON

Enrollment: 74 Questionnaires: 54

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 942 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	es 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	16	23	4.04	1117/1639	4.19	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	9	18	23	4.09	1021/1639	4.30	4.26	4.22	4.17	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	18	25	4.11	925/1397	4.34	4.38	4.28	4.18	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	3	4	9	12	10	3.58	1378/1583	3.94	4.28	4.19	4.01	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	6	18	24	4.17	648/1532	4.25	4.35	4.01	3.88	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	3	6	4	6	7	3.31	1323/1504	3.75	4.21	4.05	3.78	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	3	11	34	4.38	669/1612	4.33	4.35	4.16	4.10	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	51	4.91	,		4.62	4.65		4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	2	2	8	12	16	3.95	972/1579	4.05	4.25	4.08	3.95	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	14	32	4.40	957/1518		4.60	4.43	4.38	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	9	40		1019/1520		4.85	4.70	4.61	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	5	8	14	24		1083/1517		4.44	4.27	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	2	4	13	28		1062/1550		4.42	4.22	4.17	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	7	3	11	14	17	3.60	933/1295	4.07	4.16	3.94	3.84	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	8	4	4	8	9		1229/1398		3.96	4.07	3.85	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	6	3	8	5	12		1244/1391		4.30	4.30	4.07	3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	3	3	8	16		1007/1388		4.40	4.28		3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	21	23	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	****/ 958	3.20	3.87	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	***	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 215		5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85		4.90	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82		4.83	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 78		5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80		4.90	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53		5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42		5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 37		5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 50		5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 43		5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 32		5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title WESTERN CIV TO 1700

Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON

Enrollment: 74
Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 942 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	Α	21	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	54	Non-major	50
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

WESTERN CIV TO 1700

Title

Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 23

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 943 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	2	0	0	1	1	7	10	1 12	726/1620	4 10	4 41	4 07	4.08	4.43
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	2 2	0	0	1 0	1 4	7 3	12 14	4.43	726/1639 567/1639	4.19 4.30	4.41 4.26	4.27 4.22	4.08	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3 7	12	4.48	560/1397		4.28	4.22	4.17	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	8	9	4.14	900/1583		4.28	4.19	4.18	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	10	9	4.24	598/1532	4.25	4.35	4.19	3.88	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	945/1504		4.21	4.05	3.78	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	837/1612	4.33	4.35	4.16	4.10	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	10		1165/1635		4.62	4.65	4.56	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	657/1579		4.25	4.08		4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	454/1518	4.65	4.60	4.43	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	328/1520	4.84	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0		14	4.60	474/1517	4.40	4.44	4.27	4.20	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	468/1550	4.42	4.42	4.22	4.17	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	383/1295	4.07	4.16	3.94	3.84	4.35
Discussion	0	0	0	-	0		_	4 01	660/1200	2 60	2 06	4 05	2 05	4 01
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	660/1398	3.69	3.96	4.07	3.85	4.21
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> </ol>	9	0	0	0	1	4	9 7	4.57	564/1391	4.08	4.30	4.30	4.07	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9 9	9	2	0	1 1	6 1	1	4.43	721/1388 ****/ 958	4.23 3.20	4.40 3.87	4.28	4.01 3.71	4.43
4. Were special techniques successiui	9	9	2	U	1	1	1	2.00	/ 950	3.20	3.0/	3.93	3.71	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	***	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.12	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80 ****/ 82	****	4.90	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	3.90	^^^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Title WESTERN CIV TO 1700

Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 23

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 943 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 110 0401 University of Mary:
Title WESTERN CIV TO 1700 Baltimore County
Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSA Fall 2007

Enrollment:

76

University of Maryland Page 944
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	51	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	----	---------------	--------------	---------------

							Fre	_	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	2	2	9	12	24	4.10	1068/1639	4.19	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.10
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	4	2	17	26	4.33	787/1639	4.30	4.26	4.22	4.17	4.33
		estions reflec			2	0	0	2	4	14	29	4.43	632/1397	4.34	4.38	4.28	4.18	4.43
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	1	0	5	7	14	22	4.10	939/1583	3.94	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.10
				what you learned	3	0	0	2	5	16	25	4.33	506/1532	4.25	4.35	4.01	3.88	4.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	0	2	3	7	14	21	4.04	802/1504	3.75	4.21	4.05	3.78	4.04
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	1	2	3	14	28	4.38	669/1612	4.33	4.35	4.16	4.10	4.38
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	2	46	4.96	331/1635	4.78	4.62	4.65	4.56	4.96
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	11	0	1	0	8	22	9	3.95	972/1579	4.05	4.25	4.08	3.95	3.95
		Lectur	2															
1 Were +h	he instri	actor's lecture		nrenared	2	0	0	0	0	10	39	4.80	378/1518	4.65	4.60	4.43	4.38	4.80
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	6	43	4.88	622/1520	4.84	4.85	4.70	4.61	
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	9	35	4.61		4.40	4.44	4.27	4.20	4.61
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	8	5	36	4.57	. , .	4.42	4.42	4.22		4.57
				our understanding	4	1	0	2	10	8	26	4.26	451/1295		4.16			
J. DIG AU	alovisuai	r recinitques en	lance y	our understanding	-	1	U	2	10	O	20	4.20	431/1293	1.07	4.10	3.94	3.01	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	23	0	3	4	4	5	12	3.68	1023/1398	3.69	3.96	4.07	3.85	3.68
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	23	0	2	1	3	4	18	4.25	816/1391	4.08	4.30	4.30	4.07	4.25
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	23	0	0	1	6	4	17	4.32	789/1388	4.23	4.40	4.28	4.01	4.32
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		23	8	3	3	4	7	3	3.20	818/ 958	3.20	3.87	3.93	3.71	3.20
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	A 19		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	15	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	в 18														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 5		Ger	nera:	1				7	Under-g	rad 5	1	Non-	major	48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.0						
				? 1														

Title WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700

Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 22

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 945 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	1016/1639	9 4.23	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.14
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24			4.26	4.22	4.17	4.24
		estions reflect	_	_	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52			4.38	4.28	4.18	4.52
	_	ations reflect	_	-	2	2	0	2	3	8	5		1171/1583		4.28	4.19	4.01	
		adings contribu	_	_	1	1	2	1	3	7	7	3.80			4.35	4.01	3.88	3.80
	_	-		what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	8	5	3.84			4.21	4.05	3.78	3.84
		system clearly			1	0	0	2	2	9	8		982/1612		4.35	4.16	4.10	4.10
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	12	8		1235/163		4.62	4.65	4.56	4.40
	_			ng effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	12	-		691/1579			4.08		4.22
		Lecture																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures		epared	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	561/1518	3 4.78	4.60	4.43	4.38	4.70
		tor seem intere	_	-	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75			4.85	4.70	4.61	4.75
		erial presented			2	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	886/151		4.44	4.27	4.20	4.25
		s contribute to			2	0	0	0	2	4		4.60				4.22	4.17	
				r understanding	2	1	1	2	1	9	6	3.89	738/129!				3.84	
J. Did auc	alovisuai	ceciniiques em	lance you	i understanding	۷	1		2		,	0	3.09	730/129.	7.10	4.10	3.74	3.01	3.09
1 Did ala	aa diaan	Discuss ssions contribu		at way laawaad	11	0	1	1	4	1	4	2 55	1093/1398	3.98	2 06	4.07	3.85	3.55
				-	11	0	0	1	1	2	7						4.07	4.36
		ts actively end	_				-	_	_				727/139:		4.30	4.30		
				open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	. ,		4.40	4.28	4.01	4.36
4. were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	SIUI		11	9	U	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	3 4.33	3.87	3.93	3.71	
		Laborat	_															
		rease understan			21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 22		****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequat	e backgr	ound information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	) ****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
		Field W																
	_	ience contribut		-	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52		1.00	4.04	3.61	****
		understand you			21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53		5.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the	e instruc	tor available f	or consu	ltation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	2 ****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****
		Self P	aced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	) ****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did stu	udy quest	ions make clear	the exp	ected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	2 ****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were yo	our conta	cts with the in	structor	helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	3 ****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			T	уре			Majors	\$
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajor	s	7	Graduat	te	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		~		,				4	**** - 3 -		20	37		0.0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	Т				4	Under-	grad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								0			. 1			.1.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		ΕTE	ecti	ves				0		Means t			_	111
				P 0		Q						_	respons	ses to b	be sigr	niicar	1T	
				I 0		Oth	ner					6						
				? 2														

Title WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700

Instructor: GRUBB, JAMES S

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 34

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 946 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	9	19	4.32	823/1639	4.23	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	19	4.32	787/1639	4.28	4.26	4.22	4.17	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	21	4.38	678/1397	4.45	4.38	4.28	4.18	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	4	13	10	4.07	967/1583	3.98	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	11	15	4.18	648/1532	3.99	4.35	4.01	3.88	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	12	7	9	3.73	1067/1504	3.79	4.21	4.05	3.78	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	0	10	20	4.42	603/1612	4.26	4.35	4.16	4.10	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1635	4.70	4.62	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	580/1579	4.27	4.25	4.08	3.95	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	271/1518	4.78	4.60	4.43	4.38	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	219/1520	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	417/1517	4.45	4.44	4.27	4.20	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	8	22	4.65	478/1550	4.62	4.42	4.22	4.17	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	6	8	15	4.31	413/1295	4.10	4.16	3.94	3.84	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	511/1398	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.85	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	744/1391	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.07	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	3	18	4.61	571/1388	4.49	4.40	4.28	4.01	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	3.87	3.93	3.71	4.33
Laboratory		_		_										
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtio	n									
-	_													

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: HIST 200 0101 University of Maryland Page 947 Title THEMES IN WORLD HISTOR Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: SIMPSON, BRADLE

Enrollment: 73 Questionnaires: 47

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	:s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	0	0	0	2	7	19	19	4.17	977/1639	4.17	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.17
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	20	14	11		1375/1639		4.26	4.22	4.27	3.72
		uestions reflec		_	1	0	1	1	- 5	15	24	4.30	749/1397		4.38	4.28	4.39	4.30
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	3	3	4	15	22	4.06	967/1583		4.28	4.19	4.28	4.06
				what you learned	1	0	1	5	8	12	20	3.98			4.35	4.01	4.09	3.98
				what you learned	1	0	3	1	8	17	17	3.96	,		4.21	4.05	4.09	3.96
		g system clearl		-	1	0	1	0	7	13	25	4.33	,		4.35	4.16	4.21	4.33
	_	was class canc			1	1	0	0	0	4		4.91	- ,		4.62	4.65		4.91
	-			ning effectiveness	6	0	0	1	9			3.98			4.25	4.08		3.98
		Lectur	_	,	0	•	-	0	0	1.0	0.4	4 10	1141/1510	4 10	4 60	4 42	4 40	4 10
		uctor's lecture			0	0	1	2	8	12	24		1141/1518		4.60	4.43	4.48	4.19
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	1	5	41		674/1520		4.85	4.70	4.78	4.85
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	1	8	13	12	13		1313/1517	3.60	4.44	4.27		3.60
		es contribute t		•	0	1	2	2	8	15	19		1067/1550		4.42	4.22		4.02
5. Did au	ldiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	1	4	3	15	22	4.18	521/1295	4.18	4.16	3.94	4.07	4.18
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	6	1	8	16	8	3.49	1117/1398	3.49	3.96	4.07	4.14	3.49
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	2	4	9	24	4.41	686/1391	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.41
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	8	0	0	5	2	8	24	4.31	802/1388	4.31	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.31
		echniques succe			8	10	4	4	5	10	6	3.34	784/ 958	3.34	3.87	3.93	4.00	3.34
				_														
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 22		Red	 guir	ed f	or M	a ior		2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	28
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 20						,				-	-	) -		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 2		Gei	nera	1				7	Under-q	rad 4	17	Non-	-major	19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D 0									9				5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
J_ 00 .	Ü	3.33 1.00	Ü	P 0			-001					_	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her				3	2	I COP OND		91			
				? 0		001					-							
				. 0														

Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST

Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR

Enrollment: 79
Questionnaires: 52

INDENMEYER, KR Fall 2007 79 Page 948 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	7	16	25	4.26	880/1639	4.26	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	11	38	4.74	273/1639	4.74	4.26	4.22	4.27	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	40	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	****/1397	****	4.38	4.28	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	12	32	4.55	423/1583	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	10	16	17	3.82	973/1532	3.82	4.35	4.01	4.09	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	15	31	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.21	4.05	4.09	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	9	39	4.74	238/1612	4.74	4.35	4.16	4.21	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	5	44	4.86	721/1635	4.86	4.62	4.65	4.63	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	1	12	28	4.57	312/1579		4.25	4.08		4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	9	41	4.82	330/1518	4.82	4.60	4.43	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	46	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	9	39	4.74	323/1517	4.74	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	10	34	4.56	568/1550	4.56	4.42	4.22	4.33	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	12	31	4.48	289/1295	4.48	4.16	3.94	4.07	4.48
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	_	1		3	12	31	4.40	209/1293	4.40	4.10	3.34	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
	0	0	0	2	6	18	10	4.18	602/1200	1 10	2 06	4.07	1 11	1 10
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0		-		18		682/1398	4.18	3.96		4.14	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	-	-	0	1	13	30	4.66	498/1391	4.66	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	11	32	4.70	447/1388	4.70	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	7	20	1	3	6	6	9	3.76	603/ 958	3.76	3.87	3.93	4.00	3.76
T. D b														
Laboratory	F 1	0	0	_	1	_	0	2 00	****/ 040	****	F 00	4 11	4 47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240		5.00	4.11	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar	4.0			_		_	_					4 = 0		
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	***	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	****	***
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****
o. Hold chough proceeds for all the betaches	50	_	0	J	J	_	J	1.00	, 21		3.00	1.52	3.00	

Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST

Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR

Enrollment: 79
Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 948 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	33
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	52	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 303 0101 University of Maryland SECOND WORLD WAR Baltimore County LAURIE, CLAYTON

Page 949 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 61 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

85

		0			<b>1</b> 770	3.7.7	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	-		tructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Question 	ns 		NK 	NA 				-4 	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	al															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fro	m this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	52	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.80
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clea:	r the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	49	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.26	4.22	4.20	4.75
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions refle	ct the e	xpected goals	2	0	1	0	0	8	50	4.80	240/1397	4.80	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.80
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	t the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	1	3	10	45	4.68	315/1583	4.68	4.28	4.19	4.24	4.68
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contril	bute to	what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	12	43	4.57	299/1532	4.57	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.57
		-		o what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	12	40	4.52	359/1504		4.21	4.05	4.12	4.52
		g system clear:		ined	0	0	0	0	0	7	54	4.89	123/1612		4.35	4.16	4.12	4.89
	-	was class can			1	0	0	0	0	5	55	4.92	595/1635	4.92	4.62	4.65	4.66	4.92
9. How wor	uld you	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	10	2	0	0	0	9	40	4.82	134/1579	4.82	4.25	4.08	4.07	4.82
		Lectu:	re															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	57	4.97	85/1518	4.97	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.97
		ctor seem inte			2	0	0	0	0	1	58	4.98	110/1520	4.98	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.98
3. Was led	cture ma	terial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	12	43	4.64	428/1517	4.64	4.44	4.27	4.23	4.64
		es contribute			2	0	1	0	2	3	53	4.81	276/1550	4.81	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.81
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	1	1	0	1	8	10	40	4.51	265/1295	4.51	4.16	3.94	3.95	4.51
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contril	bute to	what you learned	24	0	3	1	3	9	21	4.19	682/1398	4.19	3.96	4.07	4.13	4.19
2. Were al	ll stude	nts actively e	ncourage	d to participate	27	0	0	0	5	4	25	4.59	557/1391	4.59	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.59
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	25	0	0	1	4	10	21	4.42	730/1388	4.42	4.40	4.28	4.34	4.42
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succ	essful		25	28	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	3.97	****
		Semina	ar															
1. Were as	ssigned	topics relevant	t to the	announced theme	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the	e instru	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did res	search p	rojects contril	bute to	what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did pre	esentati	ons contribute	to what	you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were ci	riteria :	for grading mad	de clear		60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	4.08	****
		Self	Paced															
4. Was the	e feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	60	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	рe			Majors	\$
														- 				17
00-27 28-55	1 6	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 27 B 29		ке	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	S	5	Graduat	.e	0	Majo	or.	17
28-55 56-83	9		14	В 29 С 2		Ca	nera:	1			-	1	IIndon s	mad (	51	Non	-maiox	44
56-83 84-150	9 19	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	14	D 0		Ge:	nera.	Т			2	:4	Under-9	ırau (	эт	non-	-major	44
84-150 Grad.	19	3.00-3.49	13 6	р 0 F 0		רים	ectiv	a				3	#### -	Moang	-horo -	mo not	onom	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	U	P 0		БŢ	=CLT,	v C S				ی	#### - respons				_	111
				I O		O+.	her				2	:5	T CPDOILE	ا الا عام	JE BIGI	ıııcaı	10	
				? 3		OL.	TCT											
				: 3														

Course-Section: HIST 322 0101 University of Maryland Title AFROAMER HIST SINCE 18 Baltimore County

Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE

Enrollment: 34 Ouestionnaires: 28

## Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 950

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1 0 0 0 1 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 5 21 4.74 330/1639 4.74 4.41 4.27 4.28 4.74 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 2 25 4.93 102/1639 4.93 4.26 4.22 4.20 4.93 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 6 21 4.78 261/1397 4.78 4.38 4.28 4.26 4.78 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 2 5 20 4.67 323/1583 4.67 4.28 4.19 4.24 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 2 5 19 4.52 329/1532 4.52 4.35 4.01 4.05 4.52 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 7 18 4.65 253/1504 4.65 4.21 4.05 4.12 4.65 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 3 23 4.81 160/1612 4.81 4.35 4.16 4.12 4.81 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 18 4.67 1001/1635 4.67 4.62 4.65 4.66 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 1 1 5 16 4.57 322/1579 4.57 4.25 4.08 4.07 4.57 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 4 23 4.85 286/1518 4.85 4.60 4.43 4.39 4.85 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 27 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 5 22 4.81 230/1517 4.81 4.44 4.27 4.23 4.81 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 3 24 4.89 196/1550 4.89 4.42 4.22 4.20 4.89 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 5 22 4.81 106/1295 4.81 4.16 3.94 3.95 4.81 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 6 17 4.67 329/1398 4.67 3.96 4.07 4.13 4.67 1 24 4.96 91/1391 4.96 4.30 4.30 4.35 4.96 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 0 25 5.00 1/1388 5.00 4.40 4.28 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 3 4 0 4 3 13 4.29 334/958 4.29 3.87 3.93 3.97 4.29 1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 326 0101

Title HIST/AMER WMN SINCE 18

Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 951 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	eque:	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you ga	ain new insights,skills from this o	course	1	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	214/1639	4.85	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.85
2. Did the ir	nstructor make clear the expected of	goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	191/1639	4.82	4.26	4.22	4.20	4.82
3. Did the ex	xam questions reflect the expected	goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	196/1397	4.85	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.85
4. Did other	evaluations reflect the expected of	goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	228/1583	4.76	4.28	4.19	4.24	4.76
	ned readings contribute to what you		2	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	158/1532	4.79	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.79
5. Did writte	en assignments contribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	156/1504	4.79	4.21	4.05	4.12	4.79
	rading system clearly explained	•	1	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	207/1612	4.76	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.76
	times was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	13	21		1056/1635			4.65		4.62
_	you grade the overall teaching ef	fectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	7			175/1579		4.25		4.07	
	Lecture															
1 Wara tha i	instructor's lectures well prepared	a	2	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	257/1518	4.88	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.88
	instructor's lectures well prepared in the su		1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00			4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
		-			0	0	0	2			1/1520					
	re material presented and explained		1	0	-		-		32	4.94	94/1517		4.44	4.27	4.23	4.9
	ectures contribute to what you lear		1	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1550			4.22	4.20	
. Did audiov	visual techniques enhance your unde	erstanding	2	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	150/1295	4.73	4.16	3.94	3.95	4.73
	Discussion															
. Did class	discussions contribute to what you	u learned	4	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	443/1398	4.48	3.96	4.07	4.13	4.4
2. Were all s	students actively encouraged to par	rticipate	4	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	258/1391	4.87	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.8
. Did the ir	nstructor encourage fair and open o	discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	224/1388	4.91	4.40	4.28	4.34	4.9
	ial techniques successful		5	2	1	2	7	11	7	3.75	610/ 958	3.75	3.87	3.93	3.97	3.7
2. Were you p	Laboratory provided with adequate background :	information	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	***
	Quantum and															
0 57	Seminar		2.4	0	0	^	1	^	^	2 00	****/ OC	****	4 02	4 50	4 50	****
	nstructor available for individual		34	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 82		4.83	4.52	4.59	***
_	ntations contribute to what you lea	arned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80		4.90	4.47	4.65	
5. Were crite	eria for grading made clear		34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	4.08	***
	Field Work															
I. Did field	experience contribute to what you	learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52		1.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you cl	learly understand your evaluation o	criteria	34	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the ir	nstructor available for consultation	on	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	***
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-p	paced system contribute to what you	u learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earne	ed Cum. GPA Expe	cted Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	ре			Majors	;
00 27 7																
00-27 ( 28-55 1		A 12 B 19		Red	quir	eu f	ויו זי	ajor	Þ	4	Graduat	E	0	Majo	)T	9
56-83		2 0		Cer	nera	1			1	.5	Under-c	rad 3	35	Non	-major	26
		-		Gel	ııcı d.	_			1		orraer -6	rau S	, ,	14011-	ilia JUI	20
										1	шшпп	Maari - '	- la : -			-la
Grad. (	3.50-4.00 4			ΕT	ecti	ves				1	#### -					İTŢ
		P 0		0.1					_	-	respons	es to b	be sign	ııııcar	1 C	
	-	I 0		Otl	her				1	.1						

? 1

Course-Section: HIST 355A 0101 University of Maryland Page 952 Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 HIST ASIANS IN AMERICA

Instructor: MOHAN, JYOTI

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1016/1639	4.14	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	831/1639	4.29	4.26	4.22	4.20	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.28	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	670/1532	4.14	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1171/1504	3.57	4.21	4.05	4.12	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1612	4.71	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1615/1635	3.17	4.62	4.65	4.66	3.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.25	4.08	4.07	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	700/1517	4.43	4.44	4.27	4.23	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	221/1295	4.60	4.16	3.94	3.95	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	3.96	4.07	4.13	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.34	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4

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

Course-Section: HIST 387 0101

MED/HEALTH CARE IN CHI

Title MED/HEALTH C Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 953 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General				_	_				450/2500					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	23	4.63	469/1639	4.63	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	9	13		1014/1639	4.10	4.26	4.22	4.20	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	0	6	19	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	2	3	3	6		1128/1583	3.93	4.28	4.19	4.24	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	10	13	4.14	677/1532	4.14	4.35	4.01	4.05	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	908/1504	3.94	4.21	4.05	4.12	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	3	5	19	4.34	706/1612		4.35	4.16	4.12	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	265/1635		4.62	4.65	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	13	8	4.21	714/1579	4.21	4.25	4.08	4.07	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	491/1518	4.73	4.60	4.43	4.39	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	648/1520	4.87	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	687/1517	4.43	4.44	4.27	4.23	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	25	4.77	338/1550	4.77	4.42	4.22	4.20	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	6	6	5	7	3.26	1101/1295	3.26	4.16	3.94	3.95	3.26
Diamonian														
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	8	4	5	2 E0	1106/1398	3.50	3.96	4.07	4.13	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	936/1391	4.11	4.30	4.07	4.13	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	920/1388	4.10	4.40	4.28	4.34	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	11	16	1	0	0	2	0		****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	3.97	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	_	U	U	2	U	3.00	/ 958		3.07	3.93	3.91	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	***	5.00	4.18	4.04	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	***	4.58	4.16	4.08	****
Dield Meule														
Field Work	27	٥	1	1	0	1	0	2 22	****/ 52	****	1 00	4 0 4	4 70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	1			-		,	****	1.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0 2	1	0	1	1	0		,	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27		-	-	-	_	0		,		5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27 27	1 2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 37 ****/ 32	****	5.00 5.00	4.58 4.56	4.52 4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	2	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.50	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: HIST 387 0101

Title MED/HEALTH CARE IN CHI

Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 953 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	12	Under-grad	30	Non-major	24
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Title THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 29

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 954 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.50
1	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	415/1639	4.61	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.61
2	5	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	589/1397	4.45	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.45
1	1	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.33
1	0	0	1	1	5	21	4.64	249/1532	4.64	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.64
1	0	0	0	5	8	15	4.36	529/1504	4.36	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.36
2	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	197/1612	4.78	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.78
1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.72	5.00
3 2	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	404/1579	4.48	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.48
Λ	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	4	25	4 86	271/1510	4 86	4 60	4 43	4 51	4.86
1	-	-	-	0	1			,					4.96
U	-		-	1	<u> </u>			- ,					4.72
0	-	-	•	4	4			, -					4.45
1	-	_	1	_	_			.,					
	U	2	_	J	J	Ι,	7.21	400/1200	7.21	4.10	3.94	4.01	7.21
4	0	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	816/1398	3.96	3.96	4.07	4.23	3.96
4	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.80
4	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.80
4	2	0	1	6	7	9	4.04	448/ 958	4.04	3.87	3.93	4.24	4.04
20	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 05	++++	4 00	4 50	4 02	****
				0	1	Τ.		,					****
28	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	/ 82		4.83	4.52	4.49	* *
	1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 3 1 0 0 0 1	1 0 1 0 2 5 1 1 1 0 1 0 2 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1  1 0 0 1 0 0 2 5 0 1 1 0 0 2 5 0 1 1 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 2 0 0 1 0 0 2 0 0 2 0 0 2 0 0 2 0 0 3 0 0 4 0 0 4 0 0 4 0 0 4 2 0	NR NA 1 2  1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2 5 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1	NR NA 1 2 3  1 0 0 1 2 1 0 0 0 2 2 5 0 0 2 1 1 0 0 1 2 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 5 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 5 2 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 4 1 0 2 1 4 4 0 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 1 4 2 0 1 6	1 0 0 1 2 7 1 0 0 0 2 7 2 5 0 0 2 8 1 1 0 1 2 11 1 0 0 1 1 2 11 1 0 0 1 1 5 d 1 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 0 3 8 2 0 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 0 0 0 3 8  0 0 0 0 0 0 4 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 0 0 1 0 4 4 1 0 2 1 4 7 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 7	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5  1 0 0 1 2 7 18 1 0 0 0 2 7 19 2 5 0 0 2 8 12 1 1 0 1 2 11 13 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 1 1 0 0 0 5 8 15 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 1 0 0 0 0 0 28 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 1 0 0 0 0 1 27 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 0 0 1 0 4 4 20 1 0 2 1 4 7 11 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4 0 0 0 1 6 7 9	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  1 0 0 1 2 7 18 4.50 1 0 0 0 2 7 19 4.61 2 5 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 1 1 0 1 2 11 13 4.33 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 4.64 d 1 0 0 0 5 8 15 4.36 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 1 0 0 0 0 28 5.00 s 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 1 0 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.48  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 27 4.96 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 0 0 1 0 4 4 20 4.45 1 0 2 1 3 5 17 4.21  4 0 2 1 4 7 11 3.96 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 4 0 0 0 1 6 7 9 4.04	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  1 0 0 1 2 7 18 4.50 615/1639 1 0 0 0 2 7 19 4.61 415/1639 2 5 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 589/1397 1 1 0 1 2 11 13 4.33 697/1583 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 4.64 249/1532 d 1 0 0 0 5 8 15 4.36 529/1504 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 197/1612 1 0 0 0 0 28 5.00 1/1635 8 2 0 0 0 0 4 25 4.86 271/1518 1 0 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.48 404/1579  0 0 0 0 0 0 4 25 4.86 271/1518 1 0 0 0 0 1 27 4.96 219/1520 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 335/1517 0 0 1 0 4 4 20 4.45 716/1550 1 0 2 1 3 5 17 4.21 489/1295  4 0 2 1 4 7 11 3.96 816/1398 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 328/1388 4 2 0 1 6 7 9 4.04 448/ 958	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  1 0 0 1 2 7 18 4.50 615/1639 4.50 1 0 0 0 2 7 19 4.61 415/1639 4.61 2 5 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 589/1397 4.45 1 1 0 1 2 11 13 4.33 697/1583 4.33 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 4.64 249/1532 4.64 d 1 0 0 0 5 8 15 4.36 529/1504 4.36 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 197/1612 4.78 1 0 0 0 0 28 5.00 1/1635 5.00 s 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 197/1612 4.78 1 0 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.48 404/1579 4.48  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 335/1517 4.72 0 0 1 0 4 4 20 4.45 716/1550 4.45 1 0 2 1 3 5 17 4.21 489/1295 4.21  4 0 2 1 4 7 11 3.96 816/1398 3.96 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 328/1388 4.80 4 2 0 1 6 7 9 4.04 448/ 958 4.04	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  1 0 0 1 2 7 18 4.50 615/1639 4.50 4.41 1 0 0 0 2 7 19 4.61 415/1639 4.61 4.26 2 5 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 589/1397 4.45 4.38 1 1 0 1 2 11 13 4.33 697/1583 4.33 4.28 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 4.64 249/1532 4.64 4.35 d 1 0 0 0 5 8 15 4.36 529/1504 4.36 4.21 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 197/1612 4.78 4.35 1 0 0 0 0 28 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.62 s 2 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.48 404/1579 4.48 4.25  0 0 0 0 0 0 4 25 4.86 271/1518 4.86 4.60 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 335/1517 4.72 4.44 0 0 1 0 4 4 20 4.45 716/1550 4.45 4.42 1 0 2 1 3 5 17 4.21 489/1295 4.21 4.16  4 0 2 1 4 7 11 3.96 816/1398 3.96 3.96 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.30 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.30 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 328/1388 4.80 4.40 4 2 0 1 6 7 9 4.04 448/ 958 4.04 3.87	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean  1 0 0 1 2 7 18 4.50 615/1639 4.50 4.41 4.27 1 0 0 0 2 7 19 4.61 415/1639 4.61 4.26 4.22 2 5 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 589/1397 4.45 4.38 4.28 1 1 0 1 2 11 13 4.33 697/1583 4.33 4.28 4.19 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 4.64 249/1532 4.64 4.35 4.01 d 1 0 0 0 5 8 15 4.36 529/1504 4.36 4.21 4.05 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 197/1612 4.78 4.35 4.16 1 0 0 0 0 28 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.62 4.65 8 2 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.48 404/1579 4.48 4.25 4.08  0 0 0 0 0 0 4 25 4.86 271/1518 4.86 4.60 4.43 1 0 0 0 0 1 27 4.96 219/1520 4.96 4.85 4.70 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 335/1517 4.72 4.44 4.27 0 0 1 0 4 4 20 4.45 716/1550 4.45 4.42 4.22 1 0 2 1 3 5 17 4.21 489/1295 4.21 4.16 3.94  4 0 2 1 4 7 11 3.96 816/1398 3.96 3.96 4.07 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.30 4.30 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.30 4.30 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 328/1388 4.80 4.40 4.28 4 2 0 1 6 7 9 4.04 448/ 958 4.04 3.87 3.93	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  1 0 0 1 2 7 18 4.50 615/1639 4.50 4.41 4.27 4.42 1 0 0 0 0 2 7 19 4.61 415/1639 4.61 4.26 4.22 4.29 2 5 0 0 2 8 12 4.45 589/1397 4.45 4.38 4.28 4.38 1 1 0 1 2 11 13 4.33 697/1583 4.33 4.28 4.19 4.31 1 0 0 1 1 5 21 4.64 249/1532 4.64 4.35 4.01 4.07 d 1 0 0 0 5 8 15 4.36 529/1504 4.36 4.21 4.05 4.20 2 0 0 0 1 4 22 4.78 197/1612 4.78 4.35 4.16 4.18 1 0 0 0 0 0 28 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.62 4.65 4.72 8 2 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.48 404/1579 4.48 4.25 4.08 4.21  0 0 0 0 0 0 4 25 4.86 271/1518 4.86 4.60 4.43 4.51 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 27 4.96 219/1520 4.96 4.85 4.70 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 22 4.72 335/1517 4.72 4.44 4.27 4.34 0 0 1 0 4 4 20 4.45 716/1550 4.45 4.42 4.22 4.24 1 0 2 1 3 5 17 4.21 489/1295 4.21 4.16 3.94 4.01  4 0 2 1 4 7 11 3.96 816/1398 3.96 3.96 4.07 4.23 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.30 4.30 4.48 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 332/1391 4.80 4.30 4.30 4.48 4 0 0 0 1 3 21 4.80 328/1388 4.80 4.40 4.28 4.50 4 2 0 1 6 7 9 4.04 448/958 4.04 3.87 3.93 4.24

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				2	2						

Course-Section: HIST 445 0101

Title HISTORY OF SCIENCE

Instructor: WELCH, G.

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 955 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	cies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	120/1639	4.94	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	400/1397	4.63	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	299/1532	4.56	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	466/1504	4.43	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2		4.44	589/1612			4.16	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.62	4.65	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4		4.73	190/1579			4.08		4.73
	_	-	-	-	-	_								
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	257/1518	4.88	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1			4.73	323/1517	4.73		4.27	4.34	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.42	4.22		4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	513/1295	4.19		3.94		4.19
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	1	3	4	0	4.19	313/1293	4.13	4.10	3.24	4.01	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	560/1398	4.33	3.96	4.07	4.23	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1391	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	783/1388	4.33	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.33
<u> </u>	7	5	0	0	0	∠ 1	3	4.33						
4. Were special techniques successful	/	5	U	U	U	Т	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	3.87	3.93	4.24	4.75
T a bassact assess														
Laboratory	1 -	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 240	****	F 00	1 11	4.26	++++
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	5.00	4.11		****
	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 215 ****/ 198	****	5.00	4.35	4.28 4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	****/ 198		5.00	4.18	4.21	
Seminar														
	1.4	-1	0	0	0	-	0	4 00	****/ 05	****	4 00	4 50	4 02	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1 0	0	0	0	1	•		****/ 85		4.90	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14		1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	***	4.83	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.30	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.59	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	4.02	****
-1.111														
Field Work		_	_	_	_	_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.56	4.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****

Course-Section: HIST 445 0101

Title HISTORY OF SCIENCE

Instructor: WELCH, G.

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 955 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: HIST 445H 0101 University of Maryland HISTORY OF SCIENCE Baltimore County

Page 956 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: WELCH, G. Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.38	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.60	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.16	3.94	4.01	5.00
_, ,														
Discussion	2	•	•	-	0	0	0	0 00	1204/1200	0 00	2 06	4 05	4 00	0 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	Τ	0	0	0		1384/1398	2.00	3.96	4.07	4.23	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	Τ	0	0		1321/1391	3.00	4.30	4.30	4.48	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.40	4.28	4.50	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: HIST 447 0101

HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT

Title Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 23

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 957 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_			_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	205/1639	4.86	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	284/1639	4.73	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	189/1397	4.86	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	597/1583	4.41	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	281/1532	4.59	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	521/1504	4.36	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	249/1612		4.35	4.16	4.18	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	4		1402/1635	4.18	4.62	4.65	4.72	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	527/1579	4.38	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	273/1520	4.95	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	230/1517	4.82	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	174/1550	4.91	4.42	4.22		4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	806/1295	3.80		3.94		3.80
J. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	2	U	1		1	5	U	3.00	000/12/3	3.00	4.10	3.74	1.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	682/1398	4.19	3.96	4.07	4.23	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	769/1391	4.31	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	471/1388	4.69	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.87	3.93	4.24	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	5.00	4.18	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 82		4.58	4.16	4.02	****
Field Work	_													
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	1.00	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****

Course-Section: HIST 447 0101

Title HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT

Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 957 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

SOCIAL HIST OF MEDICIN

Title Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 958 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	813/1639	4.30	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	850/1397	4.20	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	9	5	3.89	1171/1583	3.89	4.28	4.19	4.31	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	10	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	0	1	5	6	3.56	1177/1504	3.56	4.21	4.05	4.20	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	1109/1612	3.95	4.35	4.16	4.18	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	11	6	4.16	772/1579	4.16	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	745/1518	4.55	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	674/1520	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	886/1517		4.44	4.27	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50			4.42	4.22	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	4	4			1058/1295				4.01	
5. 214 dddiovidadi ocomilquob omanoc your anaciboanaing	ŭ	ŭ	_	_	-	-		3.30	1000, 12,0	3.30	1.10	3.71	1.01	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	3	6	5	3.76	958/1398	3.76	3.96	4.07	4.23	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	959/1391	4.06	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	882/1388	4.18	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.21	****
Seminar					_		_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.90	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.58	4.16	4.02	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	5.00	4.56	4.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	n	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****
J. Were effected enough proceeds for all the sequents	エフ	U	U	U	т.	U	U	5.00	/ 21		5.00	7.52	T.50	

Title SOCIAL HIST OF MEDICIN

Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 958 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	4	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 455 0101

THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

Title Instructor: STORCH, RUDOLPH

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Page 959 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	698/1639	4.44	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	4	6	10		1350/1639	3.76	4.26	4.22	4.29	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	5	5	8		1264/1397		4.38	4.28	4.38	3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	2	4	6	4		1261/1583		4.28	4.19	4.31	3.75
• •	1	0	0	0	8	8	9				4.26		4.07	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		-	-	-		-	-	4.04	744/1532			4.01		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	4	5	2	5		1212/1504		4.21	4.05	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2		12	4.20	, -		4.35	4.16	4.18	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	20		811/1635		4.62	4.65	4.72	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	8	7	3.91	1056/1579	3.91	4.25	4.08	4.21	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	891/1518	4.44	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	872/1520	4.76	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	4	14	4.20	947/1517	4.20	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	568/1550	4.56	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48				3.94	4.01	4.48
Diamondon														
Discussion	1 -	0	_	•	_	_	-	0 55	1252/1200	0 55	2 06	4 05	4 00	0 55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	5	0	2	3	1		1353/1398	2.55	3.96	4.07	4.23	2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	1	5	1	1		1371/1391	2.64	4.30	4.30	4.48	2.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	2	3	1	3		1308/1388	3.09	4.40	4.28	4.50	3.09
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	4.24	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	***	5.00	4.11	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 82	****	4.58		4.02	****
3. Here driveria for grading made drear	23	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 02		1.50	1.10	1.02	
Field Work									=0					****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52		1.00	4.04	4.84	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****
5. Note that though proceeds for all the students	23	0	J	J	-	J	0	3.00	, 21		3.00	1.52	1.50	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 16

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 960

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2007

Course-Section: HIST 462 0101 University of Maryland Title MEDIEVAL EUROPE Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSA

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

45

			_							~			- 1	a .		
					Fr	equei	ncie		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	508/1639	4.61	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	15	4.29	831/1639	4.29	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.29
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.43
4. Did other evaluat	tions reflect the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.43
6. Did written assignment	nments contribute t	o what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	10	15	4.36	529/1504	4.36	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.36
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expla	ined	1	0	0	2	0	7	19	4.54	459/1612	4.54	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.54
8. How many times wa	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	9	19	4.68	990/1635	4.68	4.62	4.65	4.72	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				0	1	0	1	12	12	4.31	601/1579	4.31	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.31
Lecture																
1. Were the instruct		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.78
2. Did the instructor			2	0	0	0	0	1		4.96	219/1520		4.85	4.70	4.75	4.96
3. Was lecture mater		-	2	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	486/1517	4.59	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.59
4. Did the lectures	_		2	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	457/1550		4.42	4.22	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual t		-	2	0	0	1	3	10	13	4.30	428/1295			3.94		
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss		what was learned	6	0	2	0	2	6	13	4.22	660/1398	4.22	3.96	4.07	4.23	4.22
		-	6	0	1	1	1	4		4.43	670/1391		4.30	4.30	4.48	4.43
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	7	1	20	4.78	351/1388		4.40	4.28	4.50	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful		6	15	1	0	2	0	4	3.75	610/ 958		3.87	3.93	4.24	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful			0	13	_	U	3	U	4	3.75	010/ 956	3.75	3.07	3.93	7.27	3.75
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credita Farned	Cum GDA	Expected Grades				Pe:	agon	c			Тъл	ne			Majorg	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	29	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				2	1						

Course-Section: HIST 465 0101 University of Maryland Page 961 THE RENAISSANCE Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 GRUBB, JAMES S Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		Question	

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 32

47

		Ou a shi a sa							Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did		General w insights,skil		m this source	0	0	0	0	2	3	27	4.78	281/1639	4.78	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.78
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	25	4.76	327/1639	4.78	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.78
		lestions reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	-1	26	4.84	209/1397	4.84	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.84
	_	ations reflect			0	0	1	1	2	8	20	4.41	597/1583	4.41	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.41
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.41	129/1532	4.41	4.20	4.19	4.07	4.41
	_			o what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	21	4.65	260/1504	4.65	4.33	4.01	4.07	4.65
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	4	6	22	4.56	428/1612	4.56	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.56
	-	was class cance	_	iiied	1	0	0	0	2	8	21		1056/1635	4.61	4.62	4.16	4.10	4.50
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.91		4.61	4.02		4.72	4.61
9. HOW WO	ura you g	grade the overal	.i tead	ming effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	3	21	4.90	108/1579	4.90	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.90
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.75
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	31	4.97	219/1520	4.97	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.97
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	206/1517	4.84	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.84
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	288/1550	4.81	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.81
				our understanding	3	3	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.16	3.94	4.01	4.50
		Discuss																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	322/1398	4.68	3.96	4.07	4.23	4.68
		_	_	ed to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	181/1391	4.92	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.92
		-		d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	179/1388	4.92	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.92
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sful		8	13	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	438/ 958	4.09	3.87	3.93	4.24	4.09
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						es Reasons Ty					pe			Majors	3			
00-27							quir	ed fo	or Ma	.jor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 15														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C 5		Ger	nera:	l				8	Under-g	rad 3	2	Non-	major	19
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						5 5					-							
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0							ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t			enoug	ιh
	Grad. U 3.50-4.00 8 F 0															1 6 1		

Other

22

Ρ

I

0

0

Course-Section: HIST 479 0101 University of Maryland Title CHINA, 1912 TO 1949 Baltimore County Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE

Fall 2007

Enrollment:

FILL OTTIMETIC:	57
Questionnaires:	22

Page 962 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

- ·	 	
	Evaluation	

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	572/1639	4.55	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	840/1639	4.27	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	929/1583	4.12	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	388/1532	4.45	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	629/1504	4.24	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	944/1612	4.14	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	331/1635	4.95	4.62	4.65	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	612/1579	4.29	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	345/1518	4.82	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	726/1517	4.41	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	338/1550	4.76	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	6	5	5	3.58	943/1295	3.58	4.16	3.94	4.01	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	943/1398	3.79	3.96	4.07	4.23	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	564/1391	4.57	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	2	0	1		****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	4.24	****
	8		,	3	_	Ü	_	,	, , , , , ,		2.07	2.75		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 487 0101 University of Maryland Page 963 EUROPE, 1815-1914 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 CAMPBELL, DOUG Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	COLLEGA	F'772	luation	Ouestion	naira

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

29

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 N					Inst	Instructor Course Dep		_	-	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.17
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1003/1639	4.11	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.11
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	603/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.44
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	669/1583	4.36	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.36
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.33
6. Did w	vritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	701/1504	4.17	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.17
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	376/1612	4.61	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.61
8. How m	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.62	4.65	4.72	4.83
9. How w	vould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.00
		Lectur																
1. Were	the instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	782/1518	4.53	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.53		
2. Did t	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	5	12	4.71	979/1520	4.71	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.71
3. Was 1	Lecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	572/1517	4.53	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.53
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	614/1550	4.53	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.53
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	10	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	864/1295	3.71	4.16	3.94	4.01	3.71
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	851/1398	3.93	3.96	4.07	4.23	3.93
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	594/1391	4.53	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.53
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.60
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		3	6	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	813/ 958	3.22	3.87	3.93	4.24	3.22
				Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 11				_				_	_	_	_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 2		Gei	nera	T				2	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
	P 0											responses to be significant						

Other

12

I

?

0

Course-Section: HIST 493 0101

Title COLLOQUIUM EUROPEAN HI

Instructor: HERBERT, SANDRA

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 964 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
01														
General	0	0	Ο	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.88
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		•	U	•	U	Τ	,		252/1639	4.88	4.41	4.27		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0 5	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	1/1397			4.22	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	281/1583	5.00	4.38	4.28	4.38	5.00 4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Τ	0	0	0	0	2	5 6	4.71 4.75	178/1532	4.71	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.75	1/8/1532	4.75 4.88	4.35	4.01	4.07	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.88	669/1612	4.88	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	-	0	0	0	0	5	4		1350/1635	4.38	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.38
•	0	0	0	0	0	3	5		269/1579					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	3	5	4.63	209/15/9	4.63	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.44	4.27	4.34	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.16	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1398	4.88	3.96	4.07	4.23	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	258/1391	4.88	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.87	3.93	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.90	4.58	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.83	4.52	4.49	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.90	4.47	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 82	4.75	4.58	4.16	4.02	4.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: HIST 494 0101
Title COLLOQUIUM WORLD HISTO

Instructor: SIMPSON, BRAD

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 965 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_	_	_		_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639				4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	415/1639		4.26	4.22	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1397	****	4.38	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	5.00
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1532		4.35	4.01	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504		4.21	4.05	4.20	5.00
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	632/1612	4.40	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.40
How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.25	4.08	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518		4.60	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.44		4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.80	217/1398	4.80	3.96	4.07	4.23	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388			4.28	4.50	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	U	U	U	U	U	U	5	3.00	1/1300	3.00	4.40	4.20	4.50	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.90	4.58	4.83	5.00
. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	1	1		47/ 82		4.83	4.52	4.49	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80		4.90	4.47	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 82		4.58	4.16	4.02	4.50
o. Hold ollotta for grading made ofear		J	J	J	0	_	_	1.50	55, 02	1.50	1.55	1.10	1.02	1.50

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

Course-Section: HIST 496 0101 University of Maryland Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	14

Baltimore	County	FEB	13,	2008
Fall	2007	Job	IRBF	3029

Page 966

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	670/1639	4.46	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.46
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.26	4.22	4.29	4.77
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	12	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1397	****	4.38	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	741/1583	4.31	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.31
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	4.35	4.01	4.07	3.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	466/1504	4.43	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.43
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	340/1612	4.64	4.35	4.16	4.18	4.64
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.56	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.56
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	561/1518	4.69	4.60	4.43	4.51	4.69
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.83
	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.34	5.00			
		es contribute t			2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.42	4.22	4.24	4.67
				our understanding	2	3	3	1	0	3	2	3.00	1158/1295		4.16	3.94	4.01	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	560/1398	4.33	3.96	4.07	4.23	4.33
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1391	4.82	4.30	4.30	4.48	4.82
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.40	4.28	4.50	4.64
		echniques succe		01	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	167/ 958		3.87	3.93	4.24	4.64
				Frequ	iency	r Dist	trib	utio:	n									
		Cum. GPA		_	-								_					
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	asons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors 				
00-27	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83						Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	5
84-150																		
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0			Electives				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh				
P 0									responses to be significant									
				I 0		Other 11												

Course-Section: HIST 497 0101 University of Maryland
Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH Baltimore County

Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH Baltimore Count Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 967

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1588/1639 3.13 4.41 4.27 4.42 3.13 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 1 3 2 0 2.63 1621/1639 2.63 4.26 4.22 4.29 2.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4 1 1 0 1 1 3.00 1363/1397 3.00 4.38 4.28 4.38 3.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 2 1 1 3 1 3.00 1532/1583 3.00 4.28 4.19 4.31 3.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 1 1 3.13 1402/1532 3.13 4.35 4.01 4.07 3.13 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 2 2 1 3.13 1385/1504 3.13 4.21 4.05 4.20 3.13 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 3 2 1 3.00 1519/1612 3.00 4.35 4.16 4.18 3.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 2 4 0 0 2 2.50 1629/1635 2.50 4.62 4.65 4.72 2.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 1 1 1 0 2.50 1555/1579 2.50 4.25 4.08 4.21 2.50 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 3 1 1 0 0 1.60 1517/1518 1.60 4.60 4.43 4.51 1.60 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 1 0 2 2 1 3.33 1504/1520 3.33 4.85 4.70 4.75 3.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 3 1 1 1 0 2.00 1511/1517 2.00 4.44 4.27 4.34 2.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 4 0 2 0 0 1.67 1544/1550 1.58 4.42 4.22 4.24 1.58 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 1 1 0 2.40 1364/1398 2.40 3.96 4.07 4.23 2.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 1247/1391 3.40 4.30 4.30 4.48 3.40 3 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 1 1 1 3.20 1282/1388 3.20 4.40 4.28 4.50 3.20 4. Were special techniques successful 3 0 1 3 1 0 0 2.00 937/ 958 2.00 3.87 3.93 4.24 2.00 Seminar 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* 4.90 4.47 4.59 \*\*\*\*

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

Course-Section: HIST 497 0101 University of Maryland Page 968 Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1588/1639	3.13	4.41	4.27	4.42	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1621/1639	2.63	4.26	4.22	4.29	2.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1363/1397	3.00	4.38	4.28	4.38	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1402/1532	3.13	4.35	4.01	4.07	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1385/1504	3.13	4.21	4.05	4.20	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.35	4.16	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	4	0	0	2	2.50	1629/1635	2.50	4.62	4.65	4.72	2.50
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1550	1.58	4.42	4.22	4.24	1.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1364/1398	2.40	3.96	4.07	4.23	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1247/1391	3.40	4.30	4.30	4.48	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1282/1388	3.20	4.40	4.28	4.50	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	3	1	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	2.00	3.87	3.93	4.24	2.00
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.59	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: HIST 621 0101 University of Maryland Title THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR Baltimore County

Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

# Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 969

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	354/1639	4.73	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1397	****	4.38	4.28	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	256/1532	4.64	4.35	4.01	4.10	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	830/1579	4.10	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	213/1518	4.91	4.60	4.43	4.49	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	388/1550	4.73	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	106/1295	4.82	4.16	3.94	3.95	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	Ο	2	4	4	3.91	887/1398	3.91	3.96	4.07	4.22	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	655/1391	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.47	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	317/1388	4.82	4.40	4.28	4.49	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	670/ 958	3.64	3.87	3.93	4.01	3.64
1. Here appeared becoming and a subscription	Ü	Ü	3	_	_	3	_	5.01	0.0, 350	3.01	3.07	5.75	1.01	5.51
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: HIST 645 0101 University of Maryland Title HIST OF SCIENCE TO 170

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: WELCH, G.

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Page 970 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General					_	_	_		0.00 / 0.00					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.41		4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1		1090/1639	4.00	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.35	4.01	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.62	4.65	4.81	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.60	4.43	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	1		1083/1517	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1550	4.25	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	978/1295	3.50	4.16	3.94	3.95	3.50
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	2	2	U	3.30	976/1293	3.30	4.10	3.94	3.93	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	625/1398	4.25	3.96	4.07	4.22	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.87	3.93	4.01	4.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt.i.or	า									

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

Course-Section: HIST 650 0101

Title SOC HIST OF AMER MEDCN

Instructor: ROTHSTEIN, WILL

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 971 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1416/1639	3.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.26	4.22	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.35	4.01	4.10	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.50
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1635	5.00		4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1574/1579	2.00	4.25	4.08	4.17	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.60	4.43	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1033/1520	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	894/1295	3.67	4.16	3.94	3.95	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.96	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	1		1220/1391	3.50	4.30	4.30	4.47	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1		1185/1388	3.50	4.40	4.28	4.49	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 958		3.87		4.01	
	_	_		-	•	-	_		_,,					
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.96	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.74	5.00
Seminar	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	г оо	4.90	4 50	4 50	г оо
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85 1/ 82	5.00 5.00	4.83	4.58 4.52	4.58 4.74	5.00 5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1			5.00	4.90		4.52	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 80 1/ 82		4.58	4.47 4.16	4.37	
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	2	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	1/ 02	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.37	5.00
Field Work					_	_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	48/ 52	1.00	1.00	4.04	3.64	1.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.03	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 42	5.00	5.00		4.78	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.33	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.59	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.39	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.42	5.00

Course-Section: HIST 650 0101

Title SOC HIST OF AMER MEDCN

Instructor:

ROTHSTEIN, WILL

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 971 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Course-Section: HIST 662 0101 Page 972 FEB 13, 2008 Title MEDIEVAL EUROPE Instructor: MCDONOUGH, SUSA Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 2	-	all	20	0 /									700 1101	113025
Questionnaires: 2 Student Con	ırse	Eval	uati	on Q	uest:	ionn	aire	9						
			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.35	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.50

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.60	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.50

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.16	3.94	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.96	4.07	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.40	4.28	4.49	4.50

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

Unive Bal

Course-Section: HIST 665 0101

2

THE RENAISSANCE

GRUBB, JAMES S

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 973 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.26	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.38	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.35	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.21	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.62	4.65	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.25	4.08	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.60	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.16	3.94	3.95	5.00
Planada														
Discussion	^	^	^	^	^	^	_	F 00	1 /1200	г оо	2 06	4 07	4 00	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.96	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	U	U	U	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.49	5.00

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

Course-Section: HIST 679 0101 University of Maryland Title CHINA, 1912 TO 1949 Baltimore County Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 974
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.26	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.38	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.35	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.21	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	5.00
				ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.25	4.08	4.17	5.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.60	4.43	4.49	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1517		4.44	4.27	4.32	5.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	5.00
				your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.16		3.95	5.00
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.96	4.07	4.22	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1391		4.30	4.30	4.47	5.00
		_	_	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1388		4.40		4.49	5.00
	Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	ı												
Q	3 a	G GD7		Expected Grades				D.a.		_			m				Ma =	
Credits E	.arned	Cum. GP <i>I</i>				кеа	asons	∍ 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	Λ	2 00-2 99	Λ	C 0	General							Λ	IInder-a	rad	1	Non-	maior	Λ

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

Course-Section: HIST 687 0101 University of Maryland Page 975 800 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title	EUROPE, 1815-1914	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	CAMPBELL, DOUG	Fall 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	6		

Questionnaires: 1

		Frequencies					Instructor		tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1599/1639	3.00	4.41	4.27	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.26	4.22	4.26	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1397	3.00	4.38	4.28	4.37	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	4.35	4.01	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.00	4.21	4.05	4.29	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	5.00

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

Course-Section: HIST 701 0101 University of Maryland
Title STUDY OF HISTORY Baltimore County
Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN Fall 2007

Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN
Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 976
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

				-	ncies		-		ructor	Course	-			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	248/1639	4.81	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	455/1639	4.56	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	726/1583	4.31	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.35	4.01	4.10	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	182/1504	4.75	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1003/1612	4.06	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1094/1635	4.56	4.62	4.65	4.81	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	255/1579	4.64	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.60	4.43	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	139/1550	4.93	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	5	3	2		1006/1295	3.45	4.16	3.94		3.45
<b>-</b> .														
Discussion	-	•	0	0	•	_	1.0	4 00	015/1200	4 00	2 06	4 05	4 00	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1398	4.80	3.96	4.07	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	14 13	4.93	159/1391	4.93	4.30	4.30	4.47	4.93 4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0 4	0	0	0 3	2	13 5	4.87	265/1388 531/ 958	4.87 3.91	4.40	4.28	4.49	4.87 3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	U	3	2	5	3.91	531/ 958	3.91	3.87	3.93	4.01	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.90	4.58	4.58	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.83	4.52	4.74	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	***	5.00	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	4.47	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	***	4.58	4.16	4.37	***
Freq	iency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
	_													

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 704 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ASIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY Fall 2007

Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 977

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	684/1639	4.40	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.40
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.35	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.60
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	882/1612	4.20	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.20
8. How ma	any times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall te	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.88	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.88
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.60	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.80
5. Did av	udiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	4.16	3.94	3.95	****
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.96	4.07	4.22	5.00
		nts actively encoura	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.30	4.30	4.47	4.80
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage fair	and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques successful	-	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	4.01	****
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2		Required for Majors 0						0	Graduat	 uate 4		Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 3														

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

#### Course-Section: HIST 704 0101 University of Maryland Page 978 Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 ASIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept			Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	684/1639	4.40	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.35	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	882/1612	4.20	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	4.88	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.96	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.30	4.30	4.47	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.40	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	4.01	***

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

Course-Section: HIST 714 0101 Title

SEM.IN INTELLECTUAL HI

Instructor: SIMPSON, BRAD

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2007

Page 979 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	860/1639	4.29	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.38	4.28	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	900/1583	4.14	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	553/1532	4.29	4.35	4.01	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1504	4.57	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1299/1612	3.71	4.35	4.16	4.27	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.60	4.43	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	994/1398	3.71	3.96	4.07	4.22	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.30	4.30	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	3.86	1056/1388	3.86	4.40	4.28	4.49	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.87	3.93	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.90	4.58	4.58	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.83	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	44/ 80	4.50	4.90	4.47	4.50	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.58	4.16	4.37	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: HIST 717 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title SEM. IN HIST OF SCIENC Instructor: HERBERT, SANDRA Fall 2007

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 980 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

								Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC	UMBC Level	
Questions						NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera:	 1																
1. Did you	l. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course								0	0	1	2	4.67	430/163	9 4.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.67
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals								0	1	0	2	4.33	774/163	9 4.33	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/139	7 4.00	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1010/158	3 4.00	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assi	igned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you l	earned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/153	2 5.00	4.35	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did writ	ten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you	ı learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/150	4 4.67	4.21	4.05	4.29	4.67
7. Was the	7. Was the grading system clearly explained							0	0	1	0	2	4.33	718/161	2 4.33	4.35	4.16	4.27	4.33
	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/163	5 4.00	4.62	4.65	4.81	4.00
9. How woul	ld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effec	tiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/157	9 4.00	4.25	4.08	4.17	4.00
		Lecture	е																
1. Were the	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/151	3 4.67	4.60	4.43	4.49	4.67					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject								0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1033/152	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly								0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/151	7 4.67	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.67
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learne	ed	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	832/155	0 4.33	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.33
		Discus																	
		ussions contrib				0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/139			4.07	4.22	4.67
		nts actively end				0	0	0	0	1	0		4.33				4.30		4.33
		ctor encourage :		d open dis	cussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67				4.28	4.49	
4. Were spe	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful			0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 95	3 4.00	3.87	3.93	4.01	4.00
		Semina																	
		topics relevant				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 8		4.90	4.58	4.58	5.00
		ctor available :				0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 83		4.83	4.52	4.74	4.67
		rojects contrib				0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 7		5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
_		ons contribute		-	ıed	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 8			4.47	4.50	
5. Were cri	iteria 1	for grading made	e clear			0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	60/ 83	2 3.67	4.58	4.16	4.37	3.67
					Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Re	ason	s			T	ype			Majors	3			
00-27					Re	anir	 ed f	 or M:	aior		0	Gradua	 -e	 2	Majo		 3		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	Required for Major				الماري	_	J	Gradua		_	1.10 )	, <u>.</u>	5	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-grad 1			Non-major		0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0		00.	c.a	_				_	OHACL -	5 ± 4 4	_	14011		J

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