```
Course-Section: HIST 101  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  960
Title       AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18         Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR               Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     74
Questionnaires: 47                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies         Instructor   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   1   4  16  26  4.43  749/1649  4.43  4.46  4.28  4.11  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   4   9  33  4.57  475/1648  4.57  4.38  4.23  4.16  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   2   1   9  34  4.55  505/1375  4.55  4.66  4.27  4.10  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7   1   0   2  12  25  4.50  497/1595  4.50  4.28  4.20  4.03  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   2   7  10  27  4.28  604/1533  4.28  4.27  4.04  3.87  4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12 0  4   2  11  18  4.23  723/1512  4.23  4.29  4.10  3.86  4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   5   8  33  4.53  469/1623  4.53  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   1   0   0   5  41  4.81  833/1646  4.81  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0  0   2  11  31  4.66  243/1621  4.66  4.26  4.06  3.96  4.66

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   0   1   8  37  4.70  573/1568  4.70  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   1   2  42  4.91  532/1572  4.91  4.84  4.70  4.64  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   2   6  37  4.72  406/1564  4.72  4.46  4.28  4.20  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   1   3   7  35  4.57  618/1559  4.57  4.48  4.29  4.20  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  1   0   1  11  34  4.64  227/1352  4.64  4.07  3.98  3.86  4.64

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   1   1   3  10  25  4.43  520/1384  4.43  4.12  4.08  3.86  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   0   4   8  28  4.60  540/1382  4.60  4.36  4.29  4.03  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   1   7  32  4.78  403/1368  4.78  4.46  4.30  4.01  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   6   2   1   9   7  15  3.94  492/ 948  3.94  3.86  3.95  3.75  3.94

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  42   4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 42 0  0   0   1   1   3  4.40 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 42 4  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           43   3   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1   3   0   0   0   0  43  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.14  5.00

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 43  2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 43 2  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 43  2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    43   1   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                42   1   0   0   1   2   1  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.54  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 43  0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 43  0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       43   2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   43   1   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 42  2   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.51  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 43  0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    43   0   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      43   1   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       43   2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  24  ****  4.00  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     43   2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  3.83  ****
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 101  0101                    University of Maryland                         Page  960
Title          AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18              Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    LINDENMEYER, KR                     Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      74
Questionnaires: 47                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     7             0.00-0.99    3      A    19       Required for Majors  22      Graduate    1        Major        2
 28-55     2             1.00-1.99    0      B    19
 56-83     4             2.00-2.99    1      C     2       General               6      Under-grad  46       Non-major   45
 84-150    1             3.00-3.49    1      D     0
 Grad.     1             3.50-4.00    5      F     1       Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P     1                                   responses to be significant
                                             I     0       Other                15
                                             ?     1
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 102  0201                  University of Maryland                                    Page  961
Title        AMER HIST SINCE 1877                Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SMEAD, HOWARD                       Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      44
Questionnaires:  21                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies       Instructor   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  6 14  4.62   497/1649  4.39   4.46  4.28 4.11  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  7 12  4.48   599/1648  4.43   4.38  4.23 4.16  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  5 14  4.52   529/1375  4.54   4.66  4.27 4.10  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  10  0  0  1  4  6  4.45   566/1595  4.35   4.28  4.20 4.03  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  0  4  6  9  4.10   748/1533  4.27   4.27  4.04 3.87  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 17  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  ****/1512  4.37   4.29  4.10 3.86  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  2  6 12  4.38   659/1623  4.34   4.38  4.16 4.08  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  5 16  0  3.76  1620/1646  4.33   4.76  4.69 4.67  3.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  0  0  1  6  9  4.50   374/1621  4.38   4.26  4.06 3.96  4.50

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  8 13  4.62   715/1568  4.69   4.54  4.43 4.39  4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  1 19  4.86   715/1572  4.86   4.84  4.70 4.64  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  4 16  4.71   406/1564  4.66   4.46  4.28 4.20  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  3 17  4.76   376/1559  4.67   4.48  4.29 4.20  4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  5  0  1  3  5  7  4.13   616/1352  4.23   4.07  3.98 3.86  4.13

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  0  1  4  5  4.09   764/1384  4.23   4.12  4.08 3.86  4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  9  0  0  0  4  4  4  4.00   946/1382  4.22   4.36  4.29 4.03  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  3  3  5  4.18   881/1368  4.54   4.46  4.30 4.01  4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  5  0  0  2  1  3  4.17   380/ 948  3.84   3.86  3.95 3.75  4.17

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   19  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 221  ****   ****  4.16 4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 243  ****   ****  4.12 4.08  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   1  2  0  0  0  0 18  5.00     1/ 555  5.00   4.89  4.29 4.14  5.00

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  88  ****   4.45  4.54 4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  85  ****   4.06  4.47 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  81  ****   4.38  4.43 4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  92  ****   3.93  4.35 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 13  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75    24/ 288  4.75   3.81  3.68 3.54  4.75

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****   ****  4.06 3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  48  ****   ****  4.09 3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****   ****  4.47 4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****   ****  4.38 4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  ****/ 312  ****   4.00  3.68 3.51  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  53  ****   5.00  4.30 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  30  ****   4.00  4.16 4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  41  ****   5.00  4.43 4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  24  ****   4.00  4.42 4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  ****/ 110  ****   4.24  3.99 3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 102  0301           University of Maryland                                    Page  962
Title       AMER HIST SINCE 1877          Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SCOTT, MICHELLE              Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     43
Questionnaires: 32                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies       Instructor   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   2   0   3  10  16   4.23   996/1649  4.39  4.46  4.28  4.11  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   0   2   6  22   4.55   510/1648  4.43  4.38  4.23  4.16  4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   1   1   4  25   4.71   360/1375  4.54  4.66  4.27  4.10  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   2   2  11  16   4.32   734/1595  4.35  4.28  4.20  4.03  4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   3   2   8  18   4.32   555/1533  4.27  4.27  4.04  3.87  4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   1   0  11  19   4.55   352/1512  4.37  4.29  4.10  3.86  4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   1   3   8  17   4.30   757/1623  4.34  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1   0   0   0  18  11   4.38  1310/1646  4.33  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0   0   1  17  10   4.32   607/1621  4.38  4.26  4.06  3.96  4.32

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   1   4  25   4.71   573/1568  4.69  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   1   0   1  28   4.87   690/1572  4.86  4.84  4.70  4.64  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   1   2  27   4.77   310/1564  4.66  4.46  4.28  4.20  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   0   1   4  25   4.68   499/1559  4.67  4.48  4.29  4.20  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  1   2   3   7  18   4.26   515/1352  4.23  4.07  3.98  3.86  4.26

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0   1   4   4  12   4.29   655/1384  4.23  4.12  4.08  3.86  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0   1   1   3  16   4.62   530/1382  4.22  4.36  4.29  4.03  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0   1   0   3  17   4.71   472/1368  4.54  4.46  4.30  4.01  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   1   0   1   7   5   7   3.90   533/ 948  3.84  3.86  3.95  3.75  3.90

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  29   1   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 0  0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 1 0  0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           29   1   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   1   0   0   0   0  31   5.00     1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.14  5.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29  0   0   0   0   1   2   4.67  ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 1  0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29  1   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    29   0   0   0   1   0   2   4.33  ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                27   0   0   1   0   1   3   4.20  ****/ 288  4.75  3.81  3.68  3.54  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28   0   0   0   0   1   3   4.75  ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.51  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 30  0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/  24  ****  4.00  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     30   0   0   0   0   0   2   5.00  ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: HIST 102  0401            University of Maryland                              Page  963
Title       AMER HIST SINCE 1877           Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI                Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      78
Questionnaires: 45                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies       Instructor   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  8 14 23  4.33  871/1649   4.39  4.46   4.28 4.11  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  6 17 21  4.27  885/1648   4.43  4.38   4.23 4.16  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  2 18 23  4.38  694/1375   4.54  4.66   4.27 4.10  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  7 12 24  4.27  806/1595   4.35  4.28   4.20 4.03  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  6 15 23  4.39  495/1533   4.27  4.27   4.04 3.87  4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 8 17 18  4.18  764/1512   4.37  4.29   4.10 3.86  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  1  6 10 26  4.34  708/1623   4.34  4.38   4.16 4.08  4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  7 37  4.84  765/1646   4.33  4.76   4.69 4.67  4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 5 17 17  4.31  632/1621   4.38  4.26   4.06 3.96  4.31

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  0  9 34  4.73  535/1568   4.69  4.54   4.43 4.39  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  6 38  4.86  690/1572   4.86  4.84   4.70 4.64  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  1  1  0 15 26  4.49  676/1564   4.66  4.46   4.28 4.20  4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  3 10 30  4.57  629/1559   4.67  4.48   4.29 4.20  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  1  2  5 10 26  4.32  473/1352   4.23  4.07   3.98 3.86  4.32

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  0  6  9 20  4.31  644/1384   4.23  4.12   4.08 3.86  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  2  3  4 10 17  4.03  941/1382   4.22  4.36   4.29 4.03  4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 1  5 29  4.72  461/1368   4.54  4.46   4.30 4.01  4.72
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   9  4  1  7  9  6  3.44  727/ 948   3.84  3.86   3.95 3.75  3.44

          Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1  0  0  0  0  0 44  5.00    1/ 555   5.00  4.89   4.29 4.14  5.00

          Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                42  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  ****/ 288   4.75  3.81   3.68 3.54  ****

          Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 43  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/ 312   ****  4.00   3.68 3.51  ****

          Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     44  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 110   ****  4.24   3.99 3.83  ****

                          Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      7        0.00-0.99   0        A  12       Required for Majors  26     Graduate       0      Major        4
28-55      1        1.00-1.99   0        B  22
56-83      1        2.00-2.99   3        C   3       General               6     Under-grad    45      Non-major   41
84-150     2        3.00-3.49   2        D   0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   3        F   0       Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                 3
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 103  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  964
Title       EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO           Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  VAPORIS, CONSTA                  Fall  2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      78
Questionnaires:  40                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies         Instructor    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   3   6  11  19  4.18 1047/1649  4.18  4.46  4.28  4.11  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   2   3   4  15  15  3.97 1155/1648  3.97  4.38  4.23  4.16  3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   3   3   5  10  18  3.95 1000/1375  3.95  4.66  4.27  4.10  3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   2   4   6  12  15  3.87 1219/1595  3.87  4.28  4.20  4.03  3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   3   0   2  14  20  4.23  643/1533  4.23  4.27  4.04  3.87  4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  2   5   9   7  15  3.74 1131/1512  3.74  4.29  4.10  3.86  3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   4   6  10  17  4.00 1029/1623  4.00  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0   0   0  14  24  4.63 1070/1646  4.63  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 3 0  1   4  12   9  4.12  847/1621  4.12  4.26  4.06  3.96  4.12

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   1   1  10  25  4.59  743/1568  4.59  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   1   2  34  4.89  615/1572  4.89  4.84  4.70  4.64  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   1   2   4  11  19  4.22  981/1564  4.22  4.46  4.28  4.20  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   1   2   2   9  23  4.38  861/1559  4.38  4.48  4.29  4.20  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  1   3   3   8  21  4.25  515/1352  4.25  4.07  3.98  3.86  4.25

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   3   5   7   6  11  3.53 1068/1384  3.53  4.12  4.08  3.86  3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0   2   5   6  10   9  3.59 1179/1382  3.59  4.36  4.29  4.03  3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  2   2   6   8  14  3.94 1006/1368  3.94  4.46  4.30  4.01  3.94
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   9   5   3   5   4   6  3.13  828/ 948  3.13  3.86  3.95  3.75  3.13

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  35   2   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.05  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35 0 1   0   1   1   2  3.60 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.08  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 33 6 0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           34   5   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.38  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   5   0   1   0   0  34  4.91  205/ 555  4.91  4.89  4.29  4.14  4.91

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35  3   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 3  0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 34  2   0   0   3   0   1  3.50 ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    34   1   0   2   2   0   1  3.00 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                32   1   0   1   2   1   3  3.86 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.54  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 35   0   1   0   2   0   2  3.40 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  35   0   1   0   1   1   2  3.60 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       35   3   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   35   1   0   0   2   0   2  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  36   1   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.51  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35  0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    35   0   0   0   2   0   3  4.20 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      35   1   0   0   3   0   1  3.50 ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       35   2   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  24  ****  4.00  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     35   2   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	7	Under-grad	40	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: HIST 110  0301                     University of Maryland                              Page  965
Title          WESTERN CIV TO 1700                  Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    BIRKENMEIER, JO                      Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       45
Questionnaires:   27                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies       Instructor    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  6  20  4.77  317/1649  4.77  4.46  4.28  4.11  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  2  24  4.92  118/1648  4.92  4.38  4.23  4.16  4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  0  26  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27  4.10  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  6  19  4.69  291/1595  4.69  4.28  4.20  4.03  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  1  1  5  17  4.44  432/1533  4.44  4.27  4.04  3.87  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  1  4  4  15  4.24  711/1512  4.24  4.29  4.10  3.86  4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  1  0  1  2  4  17  4.54  459/1623  4.54  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  1  24  4.96  266/1646  4.96  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  1  0  0  0 11 11  4.50  374/1621  4.50  4.26  4.06  3.96  4.50

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1  2  23  4.85  330/1568  4.85  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  26  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  7  18  4.65  486/1564  4.65  4.46  4.28  4.20  4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  2  23  4.85  272/1559  4.85  4.48  4.29  4.20  4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  1  2  3  3  17  4.27  508/1352  4.27  4.07  3.98  3.86  4.27

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  1  3  6  7  4.12  755/1384  4.12  4.12  4.08  3.86  4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  2  3 12  4.59  555/1382  4.59  4.36  4.29  4.03  4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  1  3 13  4.71  484/1368  4.71  4.46  4.30  4.01  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  10 13  0  1  0  0  3  4.25 ****/ 948  ****  3.86  3.95  3.75  ****

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.08  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2  2  0  0  0  0 23  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.14  5.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 25  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  4.31  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43  4.39  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    25  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23  1  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.54  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       25  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22  2  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.51  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    25  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.06  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    5       0.00-0.99   0        A   12       Required for Majors  13    Graduate      0      Major       0
 28-55    4       1.00-1.99   0        B    7
 56-83    5       2.00-2.99   1        C    3       General               2    Under-grad   27      Non-major  27
 84-150   1       3.00-3.49   4        D    0
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00   7        F    0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                            responses to be significant
I    0              Other              5
?    1
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 111  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  966
Title      WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700            Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BIRKENMEIER, JO                 Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     46
Questionnaires: 26                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor   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  1  5  9 11  4.15 1067/1649 4.33  4.46  4.28 4.11 4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1 10 15  4.54  521/1648 4.55  4.38  4.23 4.16 4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  2 24  4.92  133/1375 4.71  4.66  4.27 4.10 4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  1  6 11  7  3.96 1121/1595 3.98  4.28  4.20 4.03 3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5 9 11  4.15  710/1533 4.11  4.27  4.04 3.87 4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 4 4 10 5 3.58 1214/1512 3.66  4.29  4.10 3.86 3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  1  1  3  8 13  4.19  883/1623 4.38  4.38  4.16 4.08 4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 26  5.00    1/1646 5.00  4.76  4.69 4.67 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 13 9 4.35  583/1621 4.33  4.26  4.06 3.96 4.35

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  2  5 19  4.65  652/1568 4.71  4.54  4.43 4.39 4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  1  1 24  4.88  640/1572 4.89  4.84  4.70 4.64 4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 8 16  4.60  550/1564 4.59  4.46  4.28 4.20 4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  2  7 17  4.58  618/1559 4.66  4.48  4.29 4.20 4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 2 5 9 9  4.00  690/1352 4.13  4.07  3.98 3.86 4.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 2 0 1 2 2  3.29 1181/1384 3.64  4.12  4.08 3.86 3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 1187/1382 4.02  4.36  4.29 4.03 3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 1115/1368 4.08  4.46  4.30 4.01 3.71
4. Were special techniques successful                 19  5  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 948 ****  3.86  3.95 3.75 ****

                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  0  0  0  0  0 26  5.00    1/ 555 5.00  4.89  4.29 4.14 5.00

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               22  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/ 288 ****  3.81  3.68 3.54 ****

                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312 ****  4.00  3.68 3.51 ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0       A    8      Required for Majors 17   Graduate     0      Major      2
28-55     3       1.00-1.99   0       B   16
56-83     3       2.00-2.99   4       C    0      General            2     Under-grad  26      Non-major 24
84-150    2       3.00-3.49   1       D    0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   8       F    0      Electives          1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other              5
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 111  0201                University of Maryland                                Page  967
Title       WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700            Baltimore County                                     FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  GRUBB, JAMES S                   Fall   2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     59
Questionnaires:  31                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   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  1  2  8 19  4.50  644/1649  4.33  4.46  4.28  4.11  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  4  5 21  4.57  487/1648  4.55  4.38  4.23  4.16  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  3  0  6 21  4.50  546/1375  4.71  4.66  4.27  4.10  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   2  1  2  6  5 13  4.00 1067/1595  3.98  4.28  4.20  4.03  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2  1  2  5  6 14  4.07  768/1533  4.11  4.27  4.04  3.87  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 3  2  2  7  5 10  3.73 1131/1512  3.66  4.29  4.10  3.86  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  1  2  6 21  4.57  437/1623  4.38  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  0 29  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  2 14 10  4.31  632/1621  4.33  4.26  4.06  3.96  4.31


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  7 23  4.77  461/1568  4.71  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  3 27  4.90  591/1572  4.89  4.84  4.70  4.64  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  1  1  7 20  4.59  570/1564  4.59  4.46  4.28  4.20  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  6 23  4.73  419/1559  4.66  4.48  4.29  4.20  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3  0  1  4  9 13  4.26  515/1352  4.13  4.07  3.98  3.86  4.26


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  1  4  6  6  4.00  795/1384  3.64  4.12  4.08  3.86  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  0  0  3  2 10  4.47  656/1382  4.02  4.36  4.29  4.03  4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  0  0  2  5  9  4.44  722/1368  4.08  4.46  4.30  4.01  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                   15 13  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.86  3.95  3.75  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.08  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   0  1  0  0  0  0 30  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.14  5.00


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 28  1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.54  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  30  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  30  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        30  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    30  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  28  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.51  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 30  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     30  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       30  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43  4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        30  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  4.00  4.42  4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      30  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  3.83  ****

                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      6      0.00-0.99    0      A    6     Required for Majors  13    Graduate      0     Major       5
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0      B   13
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    0      C    4     General               1    Under-grad   31     Non-major  26
 84-150     1      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2      F    0     Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                          responses to be significant
I    0              Other              6
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 111Y 0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  968
Title      WESTERN CIV SINCE 1700           Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    GRUBB, JAMES S               Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   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  2  2  9  4.20 1027/1649  4.20  4.46  4.28 4.11  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  2  5  8  4.40  702/1648  4.40  4.38  4.23 4.16  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  1  0  4  9  4.50  546/1375  4.50  4.66  4.27 4.10  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  3  1  0  1  4  6  4.17  930/1595  4.17  4.28  4.20 4.03  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  1  1  2  9  4.46  410/1533  4.46  4.27  4.04 3.87  4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  2  1  2  4  4  3.54 1246/1512  3.54  4.29  4.10 3.86  3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  241/1623  4.73  4.38  4.16 4.08  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  1  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  8  4  4.23  709/1621  4.23  4.26  4.06 3.96  4.23

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  171/1568  4.93  4.54  4.43 4.39  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  414/1572  4.93  4.84  4.70 4.64  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  374/1564  4.73  4.46  4.28 4.20  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  1  0 14  4.87  250/1559  4.87  4.48  4.29 4.20  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  286/1352  4.53  4.07  3.98 3.86  4.53

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  0  4  3  6  3.73  976/1384  3.73  4.12  4.08 3.86  3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  1  2  1 10  4.43  696/1382  4.43  4.36  4.29 4.03  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0  0  2  1 11  4.64  541/1368  4.64  4.46  4.30 4.01  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  9  2  0  0  1  2  3.20  811/ 948  3.20  3.86  3.95 3.75  3.20

                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29 4.14  5.00

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68 3.54  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.72  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09 3.65  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.36  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38 4.37  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68 3.51  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30 4.17  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16 4.06  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43 4.27  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       14  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  24  ****  4.00  4.42 4.24  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99 3.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
I    0              Other              5
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 200  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  969
Title      THEMES IN WORLD HISTOR         Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   KARS, MARJOLEIN             Fall  2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      79
Questionnaires:  43                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies       Instructor   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   4   3  12  23  4.21 1018/1649  4.21  4.46  4.28  4.29  4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   2  10  15  15  3.95 1176/1648  3.95  4.38  4.23  4.25  3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   3   7  15  18  4.12  908/1375  4.12  4.66  4.27  4.37  4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   1   6   6  15  13  3.80 1260/1595  3.80  4.28  4.20  4.22  3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   3   2  12  25  4.33  555/1533  4.33  4.27  4.04  4.04  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  2   3   9  11  17  3.90 1022/1512  3.90  4.29  4.10  4.14  3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   2   1   6   6  26  4.29  768/1623  4.29  4.38  4.16  4.21  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0  23  19  4.45 1240/1646  4.45  4.76  4.69  4.63  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0  1   3   6  13  11  3.88 1078/1621  3.88  4.26  4.06  4.01  3.88


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   2   1   3  13  23  4.29 1096/1568  4.29  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   1   0   1   5  35  4.74  967/1572  4.74  4.84  4.70  4.73  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1   3   3  17  18  4.14 1046/1564  4.14  4.46  4.28  4.27  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   2   1   4   7  28  4.38  851/1559  4.38  4.48  4.29  4.33  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  2   4   9  11  15  3.80  879/1352  3.80  4.07  3.98  4.07  3.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   4   3   7  12  11  3.62 1029/1384  3.62  4.12  4.08  3.99  3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   3   2   8   9  15  3.84 1057/1382  3.84  4.36  4.29  4.19  3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  1   2   8   8  18  4.08  925/1368  4.08  4.46  4.30  4.21  4.08
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  26   3   2   3   3   0  2.55  912/ 948  2.55  3.86  3.95  3.89  2.55


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 42 0 0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.47  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11  0   0   0   1   0  31  4.94  159/ 555  4.94  4.89  4.29  4.33  4.94


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 42 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 42 0 0  1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47  3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 42 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43  3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    42  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                42  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.65  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.59  ****


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     42  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  3.72  ****


                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons               Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    3        0.00-0.99   1      A   10      Required for Majors  5      Graduate      0      Major      26
 28-55    2        1.00-1.99   0      B   16
 56-83   11        2.00-2.99   3      C   12      General              6      Under-grad   43      Non-major  17
 84-150   3        3.00-3.49   7      D    0
 Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   4      F    0      Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               26
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 201  0101          University of Maryland                                    Page  970
Title        INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST      Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MCDONOUGH, SUSA            Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      59
Questionnaires:  40                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   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  4  3  5 10 17  3.85 1319/1649  4.42  4.46  4.28 4.29  3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  2  4  4  9 20  4.05 1094/1648  4.53  4.38  4.23 4.25  4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  33  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 ****/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27 4.37  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  2  4  6 13 13  3.82 1254/1595  4.41  4.28  4.20 4.22  3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1  6  7 10 10  5  3.03 1437/1533  4.01  4.27  4.04 4.04  3.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  3  5  3 12 16  3.85 1062/1512  4.30  4.29  4.10 4.14  3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  1  4  4 13 17  4.05 1004/1623  4.40  4.38  4.16 4.21  4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  1  5 32  4.82  816/1646  4.74  4.76  4.69 4.63  4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 3  1  2  3 16  7  3.90 1069/1621  4.45  4.26  4.06 4.01  3.90


       Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  0  1  7  5 22  4.37 1012/1568  4.69  4.54  4.43 4.39  4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  1  5  1 29  4.61 1133/1572  4.81  4.84  4.70 4.73  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  2  2  8  7 17  3.97 1154/1564  4.49  4.46  4.28 4.27  3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  4  2  9  5 16  3.75 1277/1559  4.38  4.48  4.29 4.33  3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  4  2  4 11  9  6  3.41 1101/1352  3.54  4.07  3.98 4.07  3.41


       Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  2  2  5  8 10  3.81  931/1384  4.41  4.12  4.08 3.99  3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  1  4  1  7 14  4.07  929/1382  4.54  4.36  4.29 4.19  4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  1  0  2  6 18  4.48  673/1368  4.74  4.46  4.30 4.21  4.48
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  5  1  2  6  8  5  3.64  661/ 948  4.07  3.86  3.95 3.89  3.64


       Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   37  2  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16 4.45  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 37 0  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12 4.47  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 37 2  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40 4.62  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            37  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35 4.64  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  23  2  0  0  1  0 14  4.87  232/ 555  4.93  4.89  4.29 4.33  4.87


       Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 37  0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54 3.75  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 37 0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47 3.33  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 37  0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43 3.67  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     37  0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35 5.00  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 33  0  1  1  0  5  0  3.29 ****/ 288  4.50  3.81  3.68 3.65  ****


       Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  37  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 3.93  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  38  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09 4.05  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        38  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47 4.49  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    38  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38 3.66  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  32  0  1  1  0  3  3  3.75 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68 3.59  ****


       Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30 4.07  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     38  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16 1.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       38  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43 3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        38  0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/  24  ****  4.00  4.42 2.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      32  0  0  1  1  5  1  3.75 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99 3.72  ****
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 201  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  970
Title          INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST        Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    MCDONOUGH, SUSA               Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    59
Questionnaires: 40                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    2         0.00-0.99   1        A   11        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0        Major        32
28-55    4         1.00-1.99   0        B   14
56-83    5         2.00-2.99   5        C    7        General              0      Under-grad  40        Non-major     8
84-150   6         3.00-3.49   5        D    1
Grad.    0         3.50-4.00   7        F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               33
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 201  8620              University of Maryland                              Page  971
Title       INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST            Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   NOLAN, ANDREW                      Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   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  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1649   4.42  4.46  4.28  4.29  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1648   4.53  4.38  4.23  4.25  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2  1  0  0  0  0  3 5.00    1/1375   5.00  4.66  4.27  4.37  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1595   4.41  4.28  4.20  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1533   4.01  4.27  4.04  4.04  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  194/1512   4.30  4.29  4.10  4.14  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  220/1623   4.40  4.38  4.16  4.21  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2  1  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 1037/1646   4.74  4.76  4.69  4.63  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00   1/1621   4.45  4.26  4.06  4.01  5.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1568   4.69  4.54  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1572   4.81  4.84  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1564   4.49  4.46  4.28  4.27  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1559   4.38  4.48  4.29  4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0  1  0  0  0  2 3.67  970/1352   3.54  4.07  3.98  4.07  3.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1384   4.41  4.12  4.08  3.99  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1382   4.54  4.36  4.29  4.19  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1368   4.74  4.46  4.30  4.21  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  0  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  203/ 948   4.07  3.86  3.95  3.89  4.50


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1  0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/ 555   4.93  4.89  4.29  4.33  5.00


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 4  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50   37/ 288   4.50  3.81  3.68  3.65  4.50


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  5  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 312   ****  4.00  3.68  3.59  ****


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      5  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 110   ****  4.24  3.99  3.72  ****

                                 Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: HIST 306  0101                University of Maryland                            Page  972
Title        THE FIRST WORLD WAR                Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  LAURIE, CLAYTON                     Fall  2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      99
Questionnaires: 65                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   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   5  0  0  1  6  9 44  4.60  510/1649  4.60 4.46 4.28 4.27 4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5  0  0  0  8 20 32  4.40  702/1648  4.40 4.38 4.23 4.18 4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4  0  0  1  6 10 44  4.59  472/1375  4.59 4.66 4.27 4.22 4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4  2  2  1 11 15 30  4.19  903/1595  4.19 4.28 4.20 4.21 4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 0  1  3  9 16 32  4.23  653/1533  4.23 4.27 4.04 4.05 4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 3 10 19 27 4.13  808/1512  4.13 4.29 4.10 4.11 4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4  0  1  1  4 13 42  4.54  459/1623  4.54 4.38 4.16 4.08 4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4  0  0  0  0  7 54  4.89  697/1646  4.89 4.76 4.69 4.67 4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 2 0 0 4 9 33  4.63  261/1621  4.63 4.26 4.06 4.02 4.63

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6  0  0  0  3  8 48  4.76  461/1568  4.76 4.54 4.43 4.39 4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6  0  0  1  0  6 52  4.85  740/1572  4.85 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0  1  1  2 12 43  4.61  537/1564  4.61 4.46 4.28 4.25 4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6  0  2  0  3 10 44  4.59  596/1559  4.59 4.48 4.29 4.23 4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 1 2 3 7 13 30  4.20  556/1352  4.20 4.07 3.98 3.97 4.20

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0 8 2 4 5 11  3.30 1175/1384  3.30 4.12 4.08 4.11 3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0 2 6 6 5 11  3.57 1191/1382  3.57 4.36 4.29 4.37 3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 36 0 2 2 5 6 14  3.97  981/1368  3.97 4.46 4.30 4.39 3.97
4. Were special techniques successful                  36 19  1  0  2  1  6  4.10 ****/ 948  **** 3.86 3.95 4.00 ****

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 33  0  0  0  0  0 32  5.00    1/ 555  5.00 4.89 4.29 4.22 5.00

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                57  0  0  0  0  5  3  4.38 ****/ 288  **** 3.81 3.68 3.58 ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 61  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/ 312  **** 4.00 3.68 3.60 ****

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     50  0  0  0  0 12  3  4.20 ****/ 110  **** 4.24 3.99 4.05 ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0      A   15      Required for Majors  4      Graduate     0      Major      29
 28-55      3       1.00-1.99    1      B   30
 56-83     12       2.00-2.99    8      C    6      General             17      Under-grad  65      Non-major  36
 84-150    10       3.00-3.49    8      D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   10      F    0      Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               28
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 322  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  973
Title      AFROAMER HIST SINCE 18            Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   SCOTT, MICHELLE               Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires:  34                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies       Instructor   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  29  4.82  256/1649  4.82  4.46  4.28  4.27  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   5  29  4.85  182/1648  4.85  4.38  4.23  4.18  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4  30  4.88  179/1375  4.88  4.66  4.27  4.22  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0   0   0  10  22  4.69  301/1595  4.69  4.28  4.20  4.21  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   1   1   3   4  24  4.48  388/1533  4.48  4.27  4.04  4.05  4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   0   0   2   7  23  4.66  271/1512  4.66  4.29  4.10  4.11  4.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   0   7  26  4.79  189/1623  4.79  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   7  26  4.79  865/1646  4.79  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0   0   0   1   5  22  4.75  165/1621  4.75  4.26  4.06  4.02  4.75

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   0   2  31  4.94  171/1568  4.94  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   2  31  4.94  414/1572  4.94  4.84  4.70  4.64  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   0   3  30  4.91  169/1564  4.91  4.46  4.28  4.25  4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   0   4  29  4.88  238/1559  4.88  4.48  4.29  4.23  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0   0   0   6  27  4.82  129/1352  4.82  4.07  3.98  3.97  4.82

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   1   0   2   5  22  4.57  400/1384  4.57  4.12  4.08  4.11  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0   0   0   2  28  4.93  170/1382  4.93  4.36  4.29  4.37  4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0   0   0   1  29  4.97  106/1368  4.97  4.46  4.30  4.39  4.97
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   6   1   1   3   6  13  4.21  361/ 948  4.21  3.86  3.95  4.00  4.21

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  3.89  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  26   1  0   0   0   0   7  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.89  4.29  4.22  ****

              Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     33   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 31   1  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.58  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  33   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  33   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        33   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    33   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  31   0  0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.60  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 33   0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     33   0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.44  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      26   1  0   0   0   7   0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  4.05  ****

                                Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   1       A   13      Required for Majors   4     Graduate      0      Major      18
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0       B   17
 56-83     7      2.00-2.99   1       C    1      General              15     Under-grad   34      Non-major  16
 84-150    7      3.00-3.49   5       D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   3       F    0      Electives             2     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
```

```
I     0              Other              12
?     2
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 355A 0101                 University of Maryland                          Page  974
Title      AM INTELLIGENCE REV-9/                Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   LAURIE, CLAYTON                       Fall  2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     65
Questionnaires: 38                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   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 38 5.00    1/1649 5.00  4.46  4.28 4.27  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2 36 4.95   89/1648 4.95  4.38  4.23 4.18  4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1 37 4.97   50/1375 4.97  4.66  4.27 4.22  4.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  0  5 31 4.86  156/1595 4.86  4.28  4.20 4.21  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  0  3 34 4.82  146/1533 4.82  4.27  4.04 4.05  4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  4 34 4.89  114/1512 4.89  4.29  4.10 4.11  4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  1 37 4.97   37/1623 4.97  4.38  4.16 4.08  4.97
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 32  6 4.16 1469/1646 4.16  4.76  4.69 4.67  4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  0  0  0  2 29 4.94   66/1621 4.94  4.26  4.06 4.02  4.94

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1  2 34 4.89  259/1568 4.89  4.54  4.43 4.39  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0 37 5.00    1/1572 5.00  4.84  4.70 4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  3 32 4.81  253/1564 4.81  4.46  4.28 4.25  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  0 36 4.95  123/1559 4.95  4.48  4.29 4.23  4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  1  9 27 4.70  182/1352 4.70  4.07  3.98 3.97  4.70

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0  1  0  2  3 16 4.50  437/1384 4.50  4.12  4.08 4.11  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0  1  0  0  2 19 4.73  425/1382 4.73  4.36  4.29 4.37  4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16  0  1  0  0  2 19 4.73  461/1368 4.73  4.46  4.30 4.39  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                  16 15  2  0  0  1  4 3.71 ****/ 948 ****  3.86  3.95 4.00  ****

                 Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  5  0  0  0  0  0 33 5.00    1/ 555 5.00  4.89  4.29 4.22  5.00

                 Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                30  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88 ****/ 288 ****  3.81  3.68 3.58  ****

                 Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 36  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 312 ****  4.00  3.68 3.60  ****

                 Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     37  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 110 ****  4.24  3.99 4.05  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	38	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	3						

```
Course-Section: HIST 355B 0101              University of Maryland                              Page  975
Title       NATIVE AMERICANS                  Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BOUTON, TERRY                     Fall  2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      34
Questionnaires: 25                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    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  1  0  5 19  4.68  421/1649  4.68  4.46  4.28  4.27  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  2  1  6 16  4.44  643/1648  4.44  4.38  4.23  4.18  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  7 18  4.72  347/1375  4.72  4.66  4.27  4.22  4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   4   0  2  1 10  8  4.14  956/1595  4.14  4.28  4.20  4.21  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  1  6  6 12  4.16  703/1533  4.16  4.27  4.04  4.05  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  7  6 12  4.20  755/1512  4.20  4.29  4.10  4.11  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  1  3  7 14  4.36  683/1623  4.36  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0 10 14  4.58 1121/1646  4.58  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3   0   0  0  1  6 15  4.64  261/1621  4.64  4.26  4.06  4.02  4.64


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  1  0  2 22  4.80  387/1568  4.80  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  2 23  4.92  473/1572  4.92  4.84  4.70  4.64  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  0  3 22  4.88  187/1564  4.88  4.46  4.28  4.25  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  0  3 22  4.88  227/1559  4.88  4.48  4.29  4.23  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0   0  0  1  8 16  4.60  247/1352  4.60  4.07  3.98  3.97  4.60


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   1  0  5  6  9  4.05  781/1384  4.05  4.12  4.08  4.11  4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0  1  3  7 10  4.24  844/1382  4.24  4.36  4.29  4.37  4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4   0   0  0  1  8 12  4.52  639/1368  4.52  4.46  4.30  4.39  4.52
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  12   1  2  1  3  2  3.33  776/ 948  3.33  3.86  3.95  4.00  3.33


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   22   2   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 221  ****  ****  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22   0   0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  3.89  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 23   1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 212  ****  ****  4.40  4.21  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            22   1   0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 209  ****  ****  4.35  4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  19   1   0  0  0  1  4  4.80 ****/ 555  ****  4.89  4.29  4.22  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22   0   0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  4.63  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22   0   0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47  4.55  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 22   0   0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     22   1   0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  4.46  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 20   1   0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.58  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  23   0   0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  23   0   0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  4.21  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        23   1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.43  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    23   1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.32  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18   1   0  0  0  5  1  4.17 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.60  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22   0   0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     22   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       22   0   0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        22   2   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  4.00  4.42  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18   2   0  0  0  5  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  4.05  ****
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 355B 0101              University of Maryland                    Page  975
Title        NATIVE AMERICANS                   Baltimore County                      FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BOUTON, TERRY                        Fall   2008                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      34
Questionnaires:  25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0        A    4         Required for Majors  2    Graduate    0        Major     17
  28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0        B   14
  56-83      2         2.00-2.99    3        C    2         General              9    Under-grad  25       Non-major  8
  84-150     5         3.00-3.49    4        D    0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    3        F    0         Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                             I    0         Other                9
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 355C 8620                    University of Maryland                                      Page  976
Title        FAMOUS AMERICAN TRIALS               Baltimore County                                          FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   NOLAN, ANDREW                       Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires: 14                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies         Instructor   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 13  4.93  149/1649   4.93  4.46   4.28 4.27  4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1648   5.00  4.38   4.23 4.18  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1375   5.00  4.66   4.27 4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1595   5.00  4.28   4.20 4.21  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  128/1533   4.86  4.27   4.04 4.05  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  133/1512   4.86  4.29   4.10 4.11  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  189/1623   4.79  4.38   4.16 4.08  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1646   5.00  4.76   4.69 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   84/1621   4.92  4.26   4.06 4.02  4.92

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1568   5.00  4.54   4.43 4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1572   5.00  4.84   4.70 4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1564   5.00  4.46   4.28 4.25  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1559   5.00  4.48   4.29 4.23  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  1  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  275/1352   4.56  4.07   3.98 3.97  4.56

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1384   5.00  4.12   4.08 4.11  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1382   5.00  4.36   4.29 4.37  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1368   5.00  4.46   4.30 4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   1  0  0  0  2 11  4.85   98/ 948   4.85  3.86   3.95 4.00  4.85

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/ 555   5.00  4.89   4.29 4.22  5.00

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 288   ****  3.81   3.68 3.58  ****

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7   0  0  0  0  6  1  4.14   62/ 312   4.14  4.00   3.68 3.60  4.14
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: HIST 374  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  977
Title        EURO WOMENS HIST TO 17             Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  FROIDE, AMY                         Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    44
Questionnaires: 29                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies          Instructor    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   6  21  4.66  446/1649  4.66  4.46  4.28  4.27  4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   4   8  17  4.45  643/1648  4.45  4.38  4.23  4.18  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  24   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  ****/1375  ****  4.66  4.27  4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   1   3   8  17  4.41  622/1595  4.41  4.28  4.20  4.21  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   1   1   4  22  4.68  233/1533  4.68  4.27  4.04  4.05  4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1   0   2   1   3  21  4.59  317/1512  4.59  4.29  4.10  4.11  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   2   0  12  14  4.36  696/1623  4.36  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   4  24  4.86  748/1646  4.86  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   1  11  13  4.48  401/1621  4.48  4.26  4.06  4.02  4.48

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   6  22  4.72  535/1568  4.72  4.54  4.43  4.39  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0  29  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   6  23  4.79  278/1564  4.79  4.46  4.28  4.25  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   3   4  22  4.66  524/1559  4.66  4.48  4.29  4.23  4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  5   0   2   5   8   9  4.00  690/1352  4.00  4.07  3.98  3.97  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0   1   2   0   1  21  4.56  400/1384  4.56  4.12  4.08  4.11  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0   0   0   0   2  23  4.92  194/1382  4.92  4.36  4.29  4.37  4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0   0   0   0   1  24  4.96  106/1368  4.96  4.46  4.30  4.39  4.96
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  16   2   1   2   2   2  3.11  833/ 948  3.11  3.86  3.95  4.00  3.11

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   0   0   0   0   0  29  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.22  5.00

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 27  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.58  ****

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  28  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.60  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3      0.00-0.99   0     A    8      Required for Majors  8    Graduate      0     Major       9
 28-55     6      1.00-1.99   0     B   17
 56-83     6      2.00-2.99   2     C    1      General              9    Under-grad   29     Non-major  20
 84-150    5      3.00-3.49   7     D    0
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   6     F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other                9
                                     ?    0
```

```
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor    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  1  4  4.80   274/1649   4.80  4.46  4.28  4.27  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  1  0  0  4  4.40   702/1648   4.40  4.38  4.23  4.18  4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   233/1375   4.80  4.66  4.27  4.22  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1595   5.00  4.28  4.20  4.21  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1533   5.00  4.27  4.04  4.05  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   156/1512   4.80  4.29  4.10  4.11  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20   883/1623   4.20  4.38  4.16  4.08  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  1103/1646   4.60  4.76  4.69  4.67  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00   914/1621   4.00  4.26  4.06  4.02  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1568   5.00  4.54  4.43  4.39  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1572   5.00  4.84  4.70  4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   263/1564   4.80  4.46  4.28  4.25  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   390/1559   4.75  4.48  4.29  4.23  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   157/1352   4.75  4.07  3.98  3.97  4.75


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   541/1384   4.40  4.12  4.08  4.11  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20   869/1382   4.20  4.36  4.29  4.37  4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1368   5.00  4.46  4.30  4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   0  1  0  1  0  3  3.80   578/ 948   3.80  3.86  3.95  4.00  3.80


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/ 555   5.00  4.89  4.29  4.22  5.00


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  4   0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00    68/ 312   4.00  4.00  3.68  3.60  4.00


                                     Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: HIST 387  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  979
Title       MED/HEALTH CARE IN CHI               Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  YIP, KA-CHE                            Fall  2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      45
Questionnaires: 32                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	0	6	2	18	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.33
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	3	2	1	6	15	4.04	1106/1648	4.04	4.38	4.23	4.18	4.04
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	2	4	4	17	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.66	4.27	4.22	4.33
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	903/1595	4.19	4.28	4.20	4.21	4.19
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	3	6	14	4.24	643/1533	4.24	4.27	4.04	4.05	4.24
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	8	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	574/1512	4.35	4.29	4.10	4.11	4.35
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	7	3	1	1	2	6	12	4.23	849/1623	4.23	4.38	4.16	4.08	4.23
8.	How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.76	4.69	4.67	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	3	11	7	4.09	864/1621	4.09	4.26	4.06	4.02	4.09
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	3	21	4.65	652/1568	4.65	4.54	4.43	4.39	4.65
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.85
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	702/1564	4.46	4.46	4.28	4.25	4.46
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	3	1	19	4.31	931/1559	4.31	4.48	4.29	4.23	4.31
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	5	1	4	6	6	3.32	1138/1352	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.97	3.32
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	3	4	9	3.84	916/1384	3.84	4.12	4.08	4.11	3.84
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	3	2	3	10	3.95	997/1382	3.95	4.36	4.29	4.37	3.95
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	2	4	2	10	3.95	998/1368	3.95	4.46	4.30	4.39	3.95
4.	Were special techniques successful	13	10	2	2	1	0	4	3.22	806/ 948	3.22	3.86	3.95	4.00	3.22
	Laboratory														
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.89	4.29	4.22	****
	Seminar														
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.06	4.47	4.55	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.81	3.68	3.58	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.00	3.68	3.60	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.32	****
2.	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.16	4.44	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	24/ 110	4.33	4.24	3.99	4.05	4.33

```
                                        Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				

?   0

```
Course-Section: HIST 443  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  980
Title        THE U.S. SINCE 1945            Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  SMEAD, HOWARD                  Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     45
Questionnaires: 40                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor    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  1  2  3 33  4.74  339/1649  4.74  4.46  4.28 4.50 4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  1  1  6  8 23  4.31  839/1648  4.31  4.38  4.23 4.36 4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  2  1 14 22  4.44  629/1375  4.44  4.66  4.27 4.48 4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  3  1  3  5 11 16  4.06 1038/1595  4.06  4.28  4.20 4.36 4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  2  7  7 21  4.10  748/1533  4.10  4.27  4.04 4.14 4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 2  2  5 14 16  4.03  873/1512  4.03  4.29  4.10 4.26 4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  1  1  8 29  4.67  321/1623  4.67  4.38  4.16 4.27 4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  1  0  0  0 18 20  4.53 1175/1646  4.53  4.76  4.69 4.71 4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 1  1 13 18  4.45  442/1621  4.45  4.26  4.06 4.24 4.45

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3  0  0  2  0  7 28  4.65  667/1568  4.65  4.54  4.43 4.54 4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3  0  0  0  0  3 34  4.92  532/1572  4.92  4.84  4.70 4.79 4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  1  1  6 28  4.59  560/1564  4.59  4.46  4.28 4.40 4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3  0  1  0  1  3 32  4.76  390/1559  4.76  4.48  4.29 4.41 4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 7  3  3 11  5  7  3.34 1126/1352  3.34  4.07  3.98 4.07 3.34

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 4  2  4  4  7  3.38 1132/1384  3.38  4.12  4.08 4.35 3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0 1  2  5  2 11  3.95  988/1382  3.95  4.36  4.29 4.56 3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 1  2  2 16  4.57  601/1368  4.57  4.46  4.30 4.58 4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                   19 17 1  0  0  0  3  4.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.86  3.95 4.31 ****

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  35  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.89  4.29 4.41 ****

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 36  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68 3.71 ****

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  36  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68 3.95 ****

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      30  0  0  0  0  8  2  4.20   26/ 110  4.20  4.24  3.99 4.22 4.20

                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       1      0.00-0.99    0      A  12      Required for Majors  5      Graduate     0      Major      17
28-55       1      1.00-1.99    0      B  17                                  Under-grad  40      Non-major  23
56-83       4      2.00-2.99    8      C   7      General              6
84-150     16      3.00-3.49   11      D   1                                  #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.       0      3.50-4.00    8      F   0      Electives            0      responses to be significant
                                       P   0
                                       I   0      Other               24
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 445  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  981
Title      HISTORY OF SCIENCE              Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  TATAREWICZ, JOS               Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires:  23                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   5   4  14  4.39  789/1649  4.39  4.46  4.28  4.50  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   2   3   9   8  3.91 1218/1648  3.91  4.38  4.23  4.36  3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   3   9   9  4.04  936/1375  4.04  4.66  4.27  4.48  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4   2   0   3   5   9  4.00 1067/1595  4.00  4.28  4.20  4.36  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   2   8  10  4.04  788/1533  4.04  4.27  4.04  4.14  4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 5 8 7  4.00  883/1512  4.00  4.29  4.10  4.26  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   6   9   7  3.96 1104/1623  3.96  4.38  4.16  4.27  3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   7  16  4.70 1004/1646  4.70  4.76  4.69  4.71  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 5 8 5  3.89 1069/1621  3.89  4.26  4.06  4.24  3.89


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   2   1   3  16  4.50  852/1568  4.50  4.54  4.43  4.54  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   1   0  21  4.91  591/1572  4.91  4.84  4.70  4.79  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1   0   5   6  10  4.09 1087/1564  4.09  4.46  4.28  4.40  4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   1   2   3  15  4.36  871/1559  4.36  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 1 2 3 15  4.36  432/1352  4.36  4.07  3.98  4.07  4.36


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 3 2 2 3 2  2.92 1295/1384  2.92  4.12  4.08  4.35  2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 3 3 0 0 6  3.25 1275/1382  3.25  4.36  4.29  4.56  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 1 1 2 1 7 4.00  948/1368  4.00  4.46  4.30  4.58  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  11   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.86  3.95  4.31  ****


           Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.89  4.29  4.41  ****


           Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.95  ****


           Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0   0   0   0   5   1  4.17   30/ 110  4.17  4.24  3.99  4.22  4.17

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   1      A    3       Required for Majors  2     Graduate     0      Major       9
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0      B   15
 56-83     6        2.00-2.99   3      C    2       General              3     Under-grad  23      Non-major  14
 84-150    7        3.00-3.49   3      D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   4      F    1       Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               16
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 450  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  982
Title          SOCIAL HIST OF MEDICIN        Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    ROTHSTEIN, WILL                  Fall   2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor   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  0  4  3.71 1396/1649  3.71  4.46  4.28  4.50  3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  3  0  3  3.71 1375/1648  3.71  4.38  4.23  4.36  3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  780/1375  4.29  4.66  4.27  4.48  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  1  3  3.86 1231/1595  3.86  4.28  4.20  4.36  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  594/1533  4.29  4.27  4.04  4.14  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 4 0 2  3.29 1363/1512  3.29  4.29  4.10  4.26  3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  1  1  3  3.57 1359/1623  3.57  4.38  4.16  4.27  3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43 1268/1646  4.43  4.76  4.69  4.71  4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 1 1 2  3.80 1151/1621  3.80  4.26  4.06  4.24  3.80

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  767/1568  4.57  4.54  4.43  4.54  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  2  0  5  4.43 1305/1572  4.43  4.84  4.70  4.79  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  2  0  4  3.86 1246/1564  3.86  4.46  4.28  4.40  3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14 1045/1559  4.14  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 2 0 3  3.83  860/1352  3.83  4.07  3.98  4.07  3.83

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  726/1384  4.17  4.12  4.08  4.35  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  1  1  0  4  4.17  887/1382  4.17  4.36  4.29  4.56  4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 1 1 1 3  4.00  948/1368  4.00  4.46  4.30  4.58  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   4  0  1  1  0  0  2.50  917/ 948  2.50  3.86  3.95  4.31  2.50

           Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68  3.95  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 455  0101                   University of Maryland                                         Page  983
Title        THE ROMAN REPUBLIC                  Baltimore County                                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  PHIN, TIMOTHY J                     Fall   2008                                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     41
Questionnaires:  28                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies            Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5   Mean    Rank        Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0  0  1  6  20  4.70  383/1649   4.70   4.46  4.28  4.50  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0  0  1  6  20  4.70  310/1648   4.70   4.38  4.23  4.36  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0  0  1  5  21  4.74  309/1375   4.74   4.66  4.27  4.48  4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  16   0  0  1  4   5  4.40  636/1595   4.40   4.28  4.20  4.36  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  0  0  9  17  4.65  249/1533   4.65   4.27  4.04  4.14  4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 16  0  1  0  3   5  4.33  595/1512   4.33   4.29  4.10  4.26  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0  0  1  6  19  4.69  284/1623   4.69   4.38  4.16  4.27  4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0   0  0  0 16  10  4.38 1302/1646   4.38   4.76  4.69  4.71  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0 13  11  4.46  442/1621   4.46   4.26  4.06  4.24  4.46

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   0  0  0  2  22  4.92  220/1568   4.92   4.54  4.43  4.54  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0  0  0  1  24  4.96  237/1572   4.96   4.84  4.70  4.79  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0  0  0  7  18  4.72  406/1564   4.72   4.46  4.28  4.40  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0  0  0  3  22  4.88  227/1559   4.88   4.48  4.29  4.41  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6  0  2  4  5   8  4.00  690/1352   4.00   4.07  3.98  4.07  4.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  2  1  0  2   5  3.70  993/1384   3.70   4.12  4.08  4.35  3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0  0  0  3  1   5  4.22  851/1382   4.22   4.36  4.29  4.56  4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0  0  0  2  1   6  4.44  712/1368   4.44   4.46  4.30  4.58  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                  19  8   0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 948   ****   3.86  3.95  4.31  ****


                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1        0.00-0.99   0       A   13        Required for Majors   1      Graduate      0       Major      16
 28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0       B    5
 56-83    6        2.00-2.99   3       C    5        General               2      Under-grad   28       Non-major  12
 84-150   3        3.00-3.49   4       D    0
 Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   8       F    0        Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                18
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 462  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page  984
Title      MEDIEVAL EUROPE                          Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MCDONOUGH, SUSA                        Fall  2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      39
Questionnaires: 36                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                       Frequencies         Instructor    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   6   0   0   1   5  10  14  4.23  986/1649   4.23  4.46  4.28  4.50  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    6   0   0   0   1  12  17  4.53  521/1648   4.53  4.38  4.23  4.36  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   6  23   0   0   0   1   6  4.86 ****/1375   ****  4.66  4.27  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    6   1   1   1   5   6  16  4.21  877/1595   4.21  4.28  4.20  4.36  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   7   6  17  4.33  545/1533   4.33  4.27  4.04  4.14  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   3   9  18  4.50  380/1512   4.50  4.29  4.10  4.26  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            7   0   0   0   3   7  19  4.55  448/1623   4.55  4.38  4.16  4.27  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  7   0   0   0   0   8  21  4.72  961/1646   4.72  4.76  4.69  4.71  4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13  0   1   1   2  13   6  3.96  987/1621   3.96  4.26  4.06  4.24  3.96

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0   0   0   2   8  20  4.60  731/1568   4.60  4.54  4.43  4.54  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0   0   0   0   3  27  4.90  591/1572   4.90  4.84  4.70  4.79  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   0   2   1   7  20  4.50  651/1564   4.50  4.46  4.28  4.40  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0   0   2   2   6  20  4.47  749/1559   4.47  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6   1   2   0   8  12   7  3.76  914/1352   3.76  4.07  3.98  4.07  3.76

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0   1   1   3   6   8  4.00  795/1384   4.00  4.12  4.08  4.35  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   0   1   3   6   9  4.21  857/1382   4.21  4.36  4.29  4.56  4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17  0   0   1   2   4  12  4.42  732/1368   4.42  4.46  4.30  4.58  4.42
4. Were special techniques successful                  17  11   3   1   0   3   1  2.75 ****/ 948   ****  3.86  3.95  4.31  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  35   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 221   ****  ****  4.16  4.73  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 35  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 243   ****  ****  4.12  4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 35  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 212   ****  ****  4.40  4.57  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           35   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 209   ****  ****  4.35  4.63  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0   0   0   0   1  31  4.97   91/ 555   4.97  4.89  4.29  4.41  4.97

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  88   ****  4.45  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85   ****  4.06  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  81   ****  4.38  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    35   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  92   ****  3.93  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                32   0   0   0   0   4   0  4.00 ****/ 288   ****  3.81  3.68  3.71  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  52   ****  ****  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  34   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.09  4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        34   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39   ****  ****  4.47  4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    34   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  39   ****  ****  4.38  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  29   1   0   0   0   2   4  4.67 ****/ 312   ****  4.00  3.68  3.95  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 35   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53   ****  5.00  4.30  4.64  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     35   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30   ****  4.00  4.16  4.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       35   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  41   ****  5.00  4.43  4.84  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        35   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  24   ****  4.00  4.42  4.85  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      32   0   0   0   0   3   1  4.25 ****/ 110   ****  4.24  3.99  4.22  ****
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 462  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  984
Title       MEDIEVAL EUROPE                   Baltimore County                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MCDONOUGH, SUSA                     Fall   2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      39
Questionnaires:  36                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                      Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0         A   10          Required for Majors   4        Graduate    2        Major        15
  28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0         B   14
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0         C    4          General               7        Under-grad  34       Non-major    21
  84-150   10        3.00-3.49   6         D    0
  Grad.     2        3.50-4.00   6         F    0          Electives             2        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                          responses to be significant
                                          I    0          Other                15
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 466  0101                  University of Maryland                                    Page  985
Title        THE REFORMATION                       Baltimore County                                      FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  GRUBB, JAMES S                         Fall   2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      48
Questionnaires:  25                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.46	4.28	4.50	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	310/1648	4.71	4.38	4.23	4.36	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	258/1375	4.78	4.66	4.27	4.48	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	394/1595	4.59	4.28	4.20	4.36	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	156/1533	4.79	4.27	4.04	4.14	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.29	4.10	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.38	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	332/1646	4.96	4.76	4.69	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	159/1621	4.76	4.26	4.06	4.24	4.76
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	652/1568	4.65	4.54	4.43	4.54	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	550/1564	4.61	4.46	4.28	4.40	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	184/1559	4.91	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	432/1352	4.36	4.07	3.98	4.07	4.36
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	185/1384	4.83	4.12	4.08	4.35	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	146/1382	4.94	4.36	4.29	4.56	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	3.86	3.95	4.31	4.14
Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.89	4.29	4.41	5.00
Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.81	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	46/ 312	4.29	4.00	3.68	3.95	4.29
Self Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.24	3.99	4.22	4.00

```
                                              Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: HIST 471  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page  986
Title       BRITAIN: 1714-1848                    Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  FROIDE, AMY                            Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      37
Questionnaires:  24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   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    4   0  0  1  1  9  9  4.30  912/1649  4.30  4.46  4.28  4.50  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     4   0  0  0  1  8 11  4.50  556/1648  4.50  4.38  4.23  4.36  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    5  13  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  733/1375  4.33  4.66  4.27  4.48  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4   0  0  0  1 10  9  4.40  636/1595  4.40  4.28  4.20  4.36  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5   1  1  0  2  3 12  4.39  495/1533  4.39  4.27  4.04  4.14  4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  1  9 10  4.45  465/1512  4.45  4.29  4.10  4.26  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0  0  1  0  5 14  4.60  395/1623  4.60  4.38  4.16  4.27  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0  0  0  0  8 12  4.60 1103/1646  4.60  4.76  4.69  4.71  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  0  0  0 10  6  4.38  547/1621  4.38  4.26  4.06  4.24  4.38


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  245/1568  4.90  4.54  4.43  4.54  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  355/1572  4.95  4.84  4.70  4.79  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4   0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  101/1564  4.95  4.46  4.28  4.40  4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  0  0  1  4 15  4.70  475/1559  4.70  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  0  0  1  9 10  4.45  360/1352  4.45  4.07  3.98  4.07  4.45


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  3  6  7  4.25  673/1384  4.25  4.12  4.08  4.35  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  394/1382  4.75  4.36  4.29  4.56  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.46  4.30  4.58  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   6  1  0  1  6  2  3.80  578/ 948  3.80  3.86  3.95  4.31  3.80


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18   0  0  1  3  0  2  3.50  470/ 555  3.50  4.89  4.29  4.41  3.50


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14   0  1  5  0  4  0  2.70  249/ 288  2.70  3.81  3.68  3.71  2.70


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16   1  3  2  0  2  0  2.14  290/ 312  2.14  4.00  3.68  3.95  2.14


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     22   0  0  2  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  4.22  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0       0.00-0.99    1       A   8      Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0      Major      11
  28-55    0       1.00-1.99    0       B  12
  56-83    6       2.00-2.99    4       C   0      General              0    Under-grad   24      Non-major  13
  84-150   8       3.00-3.49    4       D   0
  Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    6       F   0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                               responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other               17
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 477  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  987
Title      HISTORY OF CHINA TO 16              Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   YIP, KA-CHE                       Fall  2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      41
Questionnaires:  20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept UMBC Level Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2 17  4.80  274/1649  4.80 4.46 4.28 4.50 4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  9 10  4.40  702/1648  4.40 4.38 4.23 4.36 4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  2 15  4.60  464/1375  4.60 4.66 4.27 4.48 4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   5  0  0  3  3  8  4.36  697/1595  4.36 4.28 4.20 4.36 4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  8  9  4.30  575/1533  4.30 4.27 4.04 4.14 4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 0  0  1  2  7  4.60  310/1512  4.60 4.29 4.10 4.26 4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  4 14  4.60  395/1623  4.60 4.38 4.16 4.27 4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1646  5.00 4.76 4.69 4.71 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0  0  2  9  5  4.19  766/1621  4.19 4.26 4.06 4.24 4.19


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  0  2 16  4.74  517/1568  4.74 4.54 4.43 4.54 4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  1 17  4.84  740/1572  4.84 4.84 4.70 4.79 4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  1  3 14  4.58  580/1564  4.58 4.46 4.28 4.40 4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  0  3 15  4.68  487/1559  4.68 4.48 4.29 4.41 4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2  0  3  4  2  8  3.88  830/1352  3.88 4.07 3.98 4.07 3.88


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  1  1  1  2  9  4.21  697/1384  4.21 4.12 4.08 4.35 4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  1  0  2  3  8  4.21  857/1382  4.21 4.36 4.29 4.56 4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  1  1  2 10  4.50  654/1368  4.50 4.46 4.30 4.58 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  11  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 948  **** 3.86 3.95 4.31 ****


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 243  **** **** 4.12 4.61 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  2  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/ 555  5.00 4.89 4.29 4.41 5.00


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  **** 3.81 3.68 3.71 ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  52  **** **** 4.06 4.86 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  48  **** **** 4.09 4.42 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  **** **** 4.47 4.52 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  **** **** 4.38 4.59 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 312  **** 4.00 3.68 3.95 ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  53  **** 5.00 4.30 4.64 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  **** 4.24 3.99 4.22 ****


                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   1      A   3       Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0       Major      15
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   1      B   6
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99   3      C   5       General               2      Under-grad   20       Non-major   5
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49   1      D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   1      F   0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                      I   0       Other                16
                                      ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 485  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  988
Title       RUSSIA TO 1900                    Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BROWN, KATHRYN                  Fall  2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 18                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor   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  3 13  4.61  497/1649  4.61  4.46  4.28  4.50  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  6 10  4.44  643/1648  4.44  4.38  4.23  4.36  4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   6  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  432/1375  4.64  4.66  4.27  4.48  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  5 10  4.39  660/1595  4.39  4.28  4.20  4.36  4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  6 11  4.65  256/1533  4.65  4.27  4.04  4.14  4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  2  5  9  4.44  479/1512  4.44  4.29  4.10  4.26  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  1  3  5  8  4.18  904/1623  4.18  4.38  4.16  4.27  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  897/1646  4.76  4.76  4.69  4.71  4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  6  9  4.50  374/1621  4.50  4.26  4.06  4.24  4.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  554/1568  4.71  4.54  4.43  4.54  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  715/1572  4.86  4.84  4.70  4.79  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  473/1564  4.67  4.46  4.28  4.40  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  261/1559  4.86  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  286/1352  4.54  4.07  3.98  4.07  4.54

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0  0  0  2  0  8  4.60  376/1384  4.60  4.12  4.08  4.35  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0  0  1  0  1  8  4.60  540/1382  4.60  4.36  4.29  4.56  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  0  5  5  4.50  654/1368  4.50  4.46  4.30  4.58  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   1  0  0  3  4  2  3.89  542/ 948  3.89  3.86  3.95  4.31  3.89

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 243  ****  ****  4.12  4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13   1  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.89  4.29  4.41  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.45  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.06  4.47  4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  81  ****  4.38  4.43  4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  3.93  4.35  4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 15  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68  3.71  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  17  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  17  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  4.42  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  13  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   11/ 312  4.80  4.00  3.68  3.95  4.80

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.64  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  4.24  3.99  4.22  ****
```

```
                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
P    0                                              responses to be significant
I    0              Other              9
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 495A 0101              University of Maryland                        Page  989
Title      PUBLIC HISTORY                    Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MERINGOLO, DENI                  Fall   2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    3
Questionnaires: 3                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies       Instructor   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   3  5.00    1/1649  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1648  5.00  4.38  4.23  4.36  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27  4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1595  5.00  4.28  4.20  4.36  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  241/1533  4.67  4.27  4.04  4.14  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0   0   0   1   2  4.67  263/1512  4.67  4.29  4.10  4.26  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1623  5.00  4.38  4.16  4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.71  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0   0   1   1  4.50  374/1621  4.50  4.26  4.06  4.24  4.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1568  5.00  4.54  4.43  4.54  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1564  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.40  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1559  5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 1219/1352  3.00  4.07  3.98  4.07  3.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1384  5.00  4.12  4.08  4.35  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.46  4.30  4.58  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/ 948  5.00  3.86  3.95  4.31  5.00

            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.41  5.00

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/  88  5.00  4.45  4.54  4.66  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/  85  5.00  4.06  4.47  4.54  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/  81  5.00  4.38  4.43  4.57  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    2   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   66/  92  4.00  3.93  4.35  4.44  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                2   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.71  4.00

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 2   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   68/ 312  4.00  4.00  3.68  3.95  4.00
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 495C 0101           University of Maryland                          Page  990
Title      ARCHIVAL ADMINISTRATIO        Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   LEE, STEVEN                Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      3
Questionnaires:  1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   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 1603/1649  3.00 4.46  4.28 4.50  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 1647/1648  2.00 4.38  4.23 4.36  2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 1591/1595  2.00 4.28  4.20 4.36  2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 1526/1533  2.00 4.27  4.04 4.14  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1428/1512  3.00 4.29  4.10 4.26  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1544/1646  4.00 4.76  4.69 4.71  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1504/1621  3.00 4.26  4.06 4.24  3.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 1567/1568  1.00 4.54  4.43 4.54  1.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1572  5.00 4.84  4.70 4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 1559/1564  2.00 4.46  4.28 4.40  2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 1557/1559  1.00 4.48  4.29 4.41  1.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1254/1384  3.00 4.12  4.08 4.35  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1382  5.00 4.36  4.29 4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  948/1368  4.00 4.46  4.30 4.58  4.00

              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   68/ 312  4.00 4.00  3.68 3.95  4.00

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 496  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  991
Title       HISTORICAL RESEARCH               Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    BOUTON, TERRY                  Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 16                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies      Instructor   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  5 10 4.56  563/1649  4.56  4.46  4.28 4.50  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  5 11 4.69  336/1648  4.69  4.38  4.23 4.36  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  10  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  212/1375  4.83  4.66  4.27 4.48  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  1  2  3  9 4.33  722/1595  4.33  4.28  4.20 4.36  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  2  2 10 4.19  688/1533  4.19  4.27  4.04 4.14  4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 4 10 4.60 310/1512 4.60  4.29  4.10 4.26  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  0  4 11 4.56  437/1623  4.56  4.38  4.16 4.27  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1  0  0  0  1 14 4.93  465/1646  4.93  4.76  4.69 4.71  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 1 5 7 4.29 654/1621 4.29  4.26  4.06 4.24  4.29

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  4 11 4.73  517/1568  4.73  4.54  4.43 4.54  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  1  0  1 13 4.73  967/1572  4.73  4.84  4.70 4.79  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 473/1564 4.67  4.46  4.28 4.40  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  2  2 11 4.60  586/1559  4.60  4.48  4.29 4.41  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1 1 4 9 4.40 399/1352 4.40  4.07  3.98 4.07  4.40

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 2 7 4.27 661/1384 4.27  4.12  4.08 4.35  4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 243/1382 4.91  4.36  4.29 4.56  4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00  1/1368 5.00  4.46  4.30 4.58  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 5   3  0  0  1  0  7 4.75  122/ 948  4.75  3.86  3.95 4.31  4.75

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 243 ****  ****  4.12 4.61  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 212 ****  ****  4.40 4.57  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  1 0 0 0 0 15 5.00   1/ 555 5.00  4.89  4.29 4.41  5.00

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  88 ****  4.45  4.54 4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  85 ****  4.06  4.47 4.54  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  81 ****  4.38  4.43 4.57  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   15   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  92 ****  3.93  4.35 4.44  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               14   0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 288 ****  3.81  3.68 3.71  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  52 ****  ****  4.06 4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  48 ****  ****  4.09 4.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      15   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  39 ****  ****  4.47 4.52  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  15   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  39 ****  ****  4.38 4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 312 ****  4.00  3.68 3.95  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  53 ****  5.00  4.30 4.64  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   15   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  30 ****  4.00  4.16 4.24  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     15   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  41 ****  5.00  4.43 4.84  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      15   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  24 ****  4.00  4.42 4.85  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    15   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 110 ****  4.24  3.99 4.22  ****
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 496  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  991
Title         HISTORICAL RESEARCH            Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BOUTON, TERRY                     Fall   2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires: 16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0       A    4       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0       Major      14
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B    6
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   2       C    3       General              0      Under-grad   16       Non-major   2
 84-150     8       3.00-3.49   5       D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   4       F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               14
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 497  0101               University of Maryland                          Page  992
Title       HISTORICAL RESEARCH               Baltimore County                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  BROWN, KATHRYN                   Fall  2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires:  11                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   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  3  6  4.36  830/1649  4.36  4.46  4.28  4.50  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  3  4  4  4.09 1070/1648  4.09  4.38  4.23  4.36  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  9  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1375  ****  4.66  4.27  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  1  1  8  4.45  566/1595  4.45  4.28  4.20  4.36  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2  3  3  2  3.27 1358/1533  3.27  4.27  4.04  4.14  3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  663/1512  4.27  4.29  4.10  4.26  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  5  5  4.36  683/1623  4.36  4.38  4.16  4.27  4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55 1157/1646  4.55  4.76  4.69  4.71  4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  483/1621  4.43  4.26  4.06  4.24  4.43


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29 1096/1568  4.29  4.54  4.43  4.54  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  931/1572  4.75  4.84  4.70  4.79  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  1  0  4  2  4.00 1127/1564  4.00  4.46  4.28  4.40  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  0  0  0  4  0  3  3.86 1221/1559  3.86  4.48  4.29  4.41  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2  1  0  3  1  1  3.17 1189/1352  3.17  4.07  3.98  4.07  3.17


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  499/1384  4.44  4.12  4.08  4.35  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  285/1368  4.89  4.46  4.30  4.58  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  1  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  389/ 948  4.14  3.86  3.95  4.31  4.14


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.41  5.00


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   45/  88  4.67  4.45  4.54  4.66  4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   38/  85  4.67  4.06  4.47  4.54  4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   51/  81  4.33  4.38  4.43  4.57  4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   66/  92  4.00  3.93  4.35  4.44  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00   83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.71  4.00


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     7  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   17/ 110  4.50  4.24  3.99  4.22  4.50

                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: HIST 643  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  993
Title       THE U.S. SINCE 1945            Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    SMEAD, HOWARD                    Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     9
Questionnaires: 9                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies        Instructor   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  9  5.00    1/1649  5.00  4.46  4.28 4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  498/1648  4.56  4.38  4.23 4.34  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  505/1375  4.56  4.66  4.27 4.44  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  497/1595  4.50  4.28  4.20 4.35  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  327/1533  4.56  4.27  4.04 4.28  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  0  3  6  4.67  263/1512  4.67  4.29  4.10 4.35  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  448/1623  4.56  4.38  4.16 4.29  4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.76  4.69 4.81  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  0  3  5  4.63  270/1621  4.63  4.26  4.06 4.20  4.63

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  1  0  8  4.78  442/1568  4.78  4.54  4.43 4.52  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70 4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0  1  2  6  4.56  600/1564  4.56  4.46  4.28 4.41  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  361/1559  4.78  4.48  4.29 4.41  4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 2 0  0  2  4  3.75  914/1352  3.75  4.07  3.98 4.10  3.75

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0  2  2  1  3.80  937/1384  3.80  4.12  4.08 4.30  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1  3  1  0  3.00 1316/1382  3.00  4.36  4.29 4.52  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0  2  2  1  3.80 1071/1368  3.80  4.46  4.30 4.56  3.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 4   3  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 948  ****  3.86  3.95 4.03  ****

             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.89  4.29 4.66  ****

             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.81  3.68 3.87  ****

             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  4.00  3.68 3.83  ****

             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    6   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   40/ 110  4.00  4.24  3.99 3.92  4.00
```

```
                                Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 645  0101               University of Maryland                                      Page  994
Title          HIST OF SCIENCE TO 170          Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    TATAREWICZ, JOS                    Fall   2008                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  2                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   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  0  0  3.00 1603/1649  3.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 1591/1648  3.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 1328/1375  3.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1397/1595  3.50  4.28  4.20  4.35  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  0  1  4.00  883/1512  4.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 1599/1623  2.50  4.38  4.16  4.29  2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0  2  0  4.00  914/1621  4.00  4.26  4.06  4.20  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1515/1568  3.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1556/1572  3.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1496/1564  3.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1550/1559  2.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1  0  0  0  2.00 1335/1352  2.00  4.07  3.98  4.10  2.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1254/1384  3.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1316/1382  3.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1286/1368  3.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  844/ 948  3.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  3.00


                             Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 650  0101                University of Maryland                                          Page  995
Title          SOC HIST OF AMER MEDCN               Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    ROTHSTEIN, WILL                      Fall   2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       6
Questionnaires:   1                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequencies          Instructor   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  1  5.00    1/1649   5.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  5.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1648   5.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  5.00
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1375   5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1537/1595   3.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  3.00
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  815/1533   4.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  4.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1623   5.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  5.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1646   5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00  914/1621   4.00  4.26  4.06  4.20  4.00

                    Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1568   5.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1572   5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1127/1564   4.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  4.00
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1559   5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00

                    Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  795/1384   4.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  4.00
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  946/1382   4.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  4.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00  948/1368   4.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  4.00


                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0        A   0          Required for Majors  0     Graduate    0      Major        0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0        B   1
 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.     0        3.50-4.00    0        F   0          Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I   0          Other                0
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 662  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  996
Title      MEDIEVAL EUROPE                     Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MCDONOUGH, SUSA                      Fall   2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
Questionnaires:  1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   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  0  4.00 1183/1649  4.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1124/1648  4.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1595  5.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  883/1512  4.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1623  5.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 1504/1621  3.00  4.26  4.06  4.20  3.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1279/1568  4.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 1127/1564  4.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1121/1559  4.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 1219/1352  3.00  4.07  3.98  4.10  3.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  795/1384  4.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  945/ 948  1.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  1.00

               Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00

               Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.00

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 666  0101             University of Maryland                        Page  997
Title       THE REFORMATION                Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  GRUBB, JAMES S                 Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
Questionnaires:  2                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   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   2  5.00   1/1649   5.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1648   5.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1375   5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1595   5.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1533   5.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1512   5.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1623   5.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1646   5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1621   5.00  4.26  4.06  4.20  5.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1568   5.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1572   5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1564   5.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1559   5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  690/1352  4.00  4.07  3.98  4.10  4.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1384   5.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1382   5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/1368   5.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00   1/ 948   5.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  5.00


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/ 555   5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00


             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      1   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  40/ 110   4.00  4.24  3.99  3.92  4.00

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1       0.00-0.99   1        A    2       Required for Majors  1     Graduate    1     Major      2
  28-55    0       1.00-1.99   0        B    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   1        D    0
  Grad.    1       3.50-4.00   0        F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                0
                                        ?    0
```

Questionnaires: 3   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   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   3  5.00    1/1649  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  362/1648  4.67  4.38  4.23  4.34  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   1   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1595  5.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  241/1533  4.67  4.27  4.04  4.28  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1512  5.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1623  5.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  234/1621  4.67  4.26  4.06  4.20  4.67

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1568  5.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1564  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1559  5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1352  5.00  4.07  3.98  4.10  5.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  326/1384  4.67  4.12  4.08  4.30  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/ 948  5.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  5.00

                 Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  490/ 555  3.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  3.00

                 Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               2   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.00

                 Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    2   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   40/ 110  4.00  4.24  3.99  3.92  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 677  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  999
Title      HISTORY OF CHINA TO 16          Baltimore County                            FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   YIP, KA-CHE                  Fall  2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    1
Questionnaires:  1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies       Instructor   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   1  5.00    1/1649  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1648  5.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1067/1595  4.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1512  5.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1029/1623  4.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1279/1568  4.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1564  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1559  5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1352  5.00  4.07  3.98  4.10  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1254/1384  3.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  948/1368  4.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  4.00

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/  53  5.00  5.00  4.30  4.37  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   18/  30  4.00  4.00  4.16  4.49  4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/  41  5.00  5.00  4.43  4.43  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   17/  24  4.00  4.00  4.42  4.67  4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/ 110  5.00  4.24  3.99  3.92  5.00

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 685  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1000
Title       RUSSIA TO 1900                  Baltimore County                           FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BROWN, KATHRYN  (Instr. A)         Fall  2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
Questionnaires:  2                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   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  2  5.00  1/1649  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1648  5.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1595  5.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1533  5.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1512  5.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1623  5.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1621  5.00  4.26  4.06  4.20  5.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1568  5.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1564  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1559  5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1352  5.00  4.07  3.98  4.10  5.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1384  5.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1368  5.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 948  5.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  5.00


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00


             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 1   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.00

                                   Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: HIST 685  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page 1001
Title       RUSSIA TO 1900                       Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)              Fall   2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      2
Questionnaires:  2                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    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  2  5.00  1/1649  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1648  5.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1595  5.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1533  5.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1512  5.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1623  5.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1568  5.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1564  5.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/1559  5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1384  5.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1368  5.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 948  5.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  5.00

                  Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00

                  Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                1  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 685  0101                University of Maryland                          Page 1002
Title        RUSSIA TO 1900                     Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                 (Instr. C)             Fall   2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      2
Questionnaires:  2                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   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  2  5.00   1/1649   5.00  4.46 4.28 4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1648   5.00  4.38 4.23 4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1375   5.00  4.66 4.27 4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1595   5.00  4.28 4.20 4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1533   5.00  4.27 4.04 4.28  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0  2  5.00   1/1512   5.00  4.29 4.10 4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1623   5.00  4.38 4.16 4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1646   5.00  4.76 4.69 4.81  5.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1568   5.00  4.54 4.43 4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1572   5.00  4.84 4.70 4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0  1  5.00   1/1564   5.00  4.46 4.28 4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1559   5.00  4.48 4.29 4.41  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1384   5.00  4.12 4.08 4.30  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1382   5.00  4.36 4.29 4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00   1/1368   5.00  4.46 4.30 4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 948   5.00  3.86 3.95 4.03  5.00

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 555   5.00  4.89 4.29 4.66  5.00

              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               1  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  83/ 288   4.00  3.81 3.68 3.87  4.00

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 685  0101                University of Maryland                            Page 1003
Title      RUSSIA TO 1900                       Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:               (Instr. D)                Fall   2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      2
Questionnaires:  2                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor    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  2  5.00   1/1649   5.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1648   5.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1375   5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1595   5.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1533   5.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1512   5.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1623   5.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1646   5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1568   5.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1572   5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1564   5.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1559   5.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  5.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1384   5.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1382   5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1368   5.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 948   5.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  5.00

                 Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/ 555   5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00

                 Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               1   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.00

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 701  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1004
Title        STUDY OF HISTORY              Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  KARS, MARJOLEIN              Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies        Instructor   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  1  1  3 12  4.53  617/1649  4.53  4.46 4.28 4.46  4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  6  8  4.24  920/1648  4.24  4.38 4.23 4.34  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1 14  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1375  ****  4.66 4.27 4.44  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  1  0  3  5  7  4.06 1032/1595  4.06  4.28 4.20 4.35  4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  1  4 10  4.29  584/1533  4.29  4.27 4.04 4.28  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  2  2 11  4.44  479/1512  4.44  4.29 4.10 4.35  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  4  4  2  7  3.71 1299/1623  3.71  4.38 4.16 4.29  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71  993/1646  4.71  4.76 4.69 4.81  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  1  1  7  7  4.25  687/1621  4.25  4.26 4.06 4.20  4.25

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  2  4  9  4.47  904/1568  4.47  4.54 4.43 4.52  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1 16  4.94  355/1572  4.94  4.84 4.70 4.83  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  6  8  4.29  897/1564  4.29  4.46 4.28 4.41  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  2  1  1 12  4.44  790/1559  4.44  4.48 4.29 4.41  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 13  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/1352  ****  4.07 3.98 4.10  ****

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  4 11  4.47  468/1384  4.47  4.12 4.08 4.30  4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  1  4 12  4.65  502/1382  4.65  4.36 4.29 4.52  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  1  2  2 12  4.47  683/1368  4.47  4.46 4.30 4.56  4.47
4. Were special techniques successful                  0 11  1  1  2  1  1  3.00  844/ 948  3.00  3.86 3.95 4.03  3.00

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  1  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89 4.29 4.66  5.00

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  1  0  0  0  4  7  4.64   47/  88  4.64  4.45 4.54 4.63  4.64
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4  0  0  2  1  2  8  4.23   63/  85  4.23  4.06 4.47 4.50  4.23
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  0  3  9  4.54   39/  81  4.54  4.38 4.43 4.43  4.54
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    4  0  0  1  0  4  8  4.46   46/  92  4.46  3.93 4.35 4.42  4.46
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                4  1  0  3  2  3  4  3.67  181/ 288  3.67  3.81 3.68 3.87  3.67

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27    4       0.00-0.99    5        A    3        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     13       Major        16
   28-55    0       1.00-1.99    0        B   12
   56-83    0       2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General              0     Under-grad    4       Non-major     1
   84-150   0       3.00-3.49    1        D    0
   Grad.   13       3.50-4.00    6        F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other               17
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 703  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1005
Title      EUR. HISTORIOGRAPHY              Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   RITSCHEL, DANIE               Fall  2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  265/1649  4.82  4.46  4.28  4.46  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  291/1648  4.73  4.38  4.23  4.34  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  9  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1375  ****  4.66  4.27  4.44  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  759/1595  4.30  4.28  4.20  4.35  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  106/1533  4.91  4.27  4.04  4.28  4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  310/1512  4.60  4.29  4.10  4.35  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  5  4  4.18  894/1623  4.18  4.38  4.16  4.29  4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  7  2  4.22  720/1621  4.22  4.26  4.06  4.20  4.22


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  588/1568  4.70  4.54  4.43  4.52  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  434/1564  4.70  4.46  4.28  4.41  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  318/1559  4.80  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  9  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1352  ****  4.07  3.98  4.10  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  201/1384  4.80  4.12  4.08  4.30  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  342/1382  4.80  4.36  4.29  4.52  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  654/1368  4.50  4.46  4.30  4.56  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  1  7  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  310/ 948  4.33  3.86  3.95  4.03  4.33


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   34/  88  4.80  4.45  4.54  4.63  4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   44/  85  4.60  4.06  4.47  4.50  4.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  1  0  0  0  3  1  4.25   54/  81  4.25  4.38  4.43  4.43  4.25
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   54/  92  4.40  3.93  4.35  4.42  4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                4  0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14   76/ 288  4.14  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.14


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    4        0.00-0.99   0       A   7        Required for Majors   0      Graduate       5      Major      9
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0       B   3
  56-83    0        2.00-2.99   0       C   0        General               0      Under-grad     6      Non-major  2
  84-150   0        3.00-3.49   2       D   0
  Grad.    5        3.50-4.00   6       F   0        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                11
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HIST 705  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1006
Title          INTRO PUBLIC HIST              Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    MERINGOLO, DENI                Fall   2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  9                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                  NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  0  1  2  6  4.56  577/1649  4.56  4.46  4.28  4.46  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  4  5  4.56  498/1648  4.56  4.38  4.23  4.34  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   8   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1375  ****  4.66  4.27  4.44  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  3  6  4.67  321/1595  4.67  4.28  4.20  4.35  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  2  3  4  4.22  653/1533  4.22  4.27  4.04  4.28  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  723/1512  4.22  4.29  4.10  4.35  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  0  1  8  4.89  130/1623  4.89  4.38  4.16  4.29  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  5  1  4.17  789/1621  4.17  4.26  4.06  4.20  4.17

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0  0  0  1  7  4.88  287/1568  4.88  4.54  4.43  4.52  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  0  3  6  4.67  473/1564  4.67  4.46  4.28  4.41  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0  0  1  2  5  4.50  695/1559  4.50  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7  2  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/1352  ****  4.07  3.98  4.10  ****

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0  0  1  0  8  4.78  228/1384  4.78  4.12  4.08  4.30  4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   7   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/ 948  ****  3.86  3.95  4.03  ****

               Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0   0   0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2  0   0  0  1  1  5  4.57   51/  88  4.57  4.45  4.54  4.63  4.57
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   26/  85  4.86  4.06  4.47  4.50  4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2  0   0  1  0  3  3  4.14   58/  81  4.14  4.38  4.43  4.43  4.14
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    2   0   0  0  0  2  5  4.71   30/  92  4.71  3.93  4.35  4.42  4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                2   0   0  0  2  2  3  4.14   76/ 288  4.14  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.14

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  4.51  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.09  4.47  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.47  4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   7   1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.38  4.44  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5   1   0  0  0  1  2  4.67   21/ 312  4.67  4.00  3.68  3.83  4.67

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  53  ****  5.00  4.30  4.37  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  30  ****  4.00  4.16  4.49  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  41  ****  5.00  4.43  4.43  ****
```

Title   INTRO PUBLIC HIST   Baltimore County   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: MERINGOLO, DENI   Fall   2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 711  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1007
Title        PRACTICUM IN PUBL HIST           Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  LEE, STEVEN                      Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  1                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   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  0  0  0  0  1.00 1649/1649  1.00  4.46  4.28  4.46  1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1648/1648  1.00  4.38  4.23  4.34  1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1592/1595  1.00  4.28  4.20  4.35  1.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1531/1533  1.00  4.27  4.04  4.28  1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1511/1512  1.00  4.29  4.10  4.35  1.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1623/1623  1.00  4.38  4.16  4.29  1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1544/1646  4.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1617/1621  1.00  4.26  4.06  4.20  1.00

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1567/1568  1.00  4.54  4.43  4.52  1.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1556/1572  3.00  4.84  4.70  4.83  3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1563/1564  1.00  4.46  4.28  4.41  1.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1557/1559  1.00  4.48  4.29  4.41  1.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1366/1384  2.00  4.12  4.08  4.30  2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1374/1382  2.00  4.36  4.29  4.52  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1356/1368  2.00  4.46  4.30  4.56  2.00

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00   87/  88  3.00  4.45  4.54  4.63  3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00   85/  85  1.00  4.06  4.47  4.50  1.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   63/  81  4.00  4.38  4.43  4.43  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00   91/  92  2.00  3.93  4.35  4.42  2.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                0   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  283/ 288  1.00  3.81  3.68  3.87  1.00

                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HIST 713  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1008
Title      SEMINAR IN SOCIAL HIST          Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: LINDENMEYER, KR               Fall  2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
Questionnaires:  4                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   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  1  4.25  965/1649  4.25  4.46  4.28  4.46  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  897/1648  4.25  4.38  4.23  4.34  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1375  5.00  4.66  4.27  4.44  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  818/1595  4.25  4.28  4.20  4.35  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  1  1  3.75 1065/1533  3.75  4.27  4.04  4.28  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  687/1512  4.25  4.29  4.10  4.35  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  1  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 1462/1623  3.33  4.38  4.16  4.29  3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.76  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  234/1621  4.67  4.26  4.06  4.20  4.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  852/1568  4.50  4.54  4.43  4.52  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  931/1572  4.75  4.84  4.70  4.83  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  939/1564  4.25  4.46  4.28  4.41  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  695/1559  4.50  4.48  4.29  4.41  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  0  2  0  1  3.67  970/1352  3.67  4.07  3.98  4.10  3.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  2  0  1  3.25 1192/1384  3.25  4.12  4.08  4.30  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  1  1  1  0  1  2.75 1350/1382  2.75  4.36  4.29  4.52  2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 1252/1368  3.25  4.46  4.30  4.56  3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                   0  1  1  0  1  0  1  3.00  844/ 948  3.00  3.86  3.95  4.03  3.00


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 555  5.00  4.89  4.29  4.66  5.00


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 3  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   83/ 288  4.00  3.81  3.68  3.87  4.00


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  3  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   68/ 312  4.00  4.00  3.68  3.83  4.00


                                   Frequency Distribution

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