

Course-Section: HIST 101 01
 Title American History To 18
 Instructor: Becker, Martin R
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 829
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	989/1447	4.13	4.54	4.31	4.18	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	4	11	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.47	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	8	8	3.96	956/1241	3.96	4.56	4.33	4.25	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	891/1402	4.13	4.42	4.24	4.15	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	6	8	3	3.26	1248/1358	3.26	4.30	4.11	4.03	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	10	8	4.04	790/1316	4.04	4.33	4.14	3.99	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	5	12	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	3	9	3	3.56	1213/1434	3.56	4.34	4.10	4.10	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	7	15	4.46	850/1387	4.46	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	5	8	8	3.79	1177/1386	3.79	4.58	4.32	4.32	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	15	4.38	783/1380	4.38	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	20	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1193	****	4.12	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	1	4	1	3	2.71	1144/1172	2.71	4.08	4.15	3.95	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1131/1182	3.14	4.37	4.35	4.18	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	4	4	3	2	3.07	1134/1170	3.07	4.52	4.38	4.17	3.07
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 12	Under-grad 24 Non-major 23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	4	6	30	4.52	562/1447	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.18	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	14	25	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	29	4.62	439/1241	4.62	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.42	4.24	4.15	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	13	22	4.26	599/1358	4.26	4.30	4.11	4.03	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	****/1316	****	4.33	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	11	27	4.52	434/1427	4.52	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	26	14	4.32	1216/1447	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	4	17	14	4.29	600/1434	4.29	4.34	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	7	31	4.66	581/1387	4.66	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	37	4.83	732/1387	4.83	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	8	29	4.59	529/1386	4.59	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	1	7	30	4.63	520/1380	4.63	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	4	12	21	4.39	382/1193	4.39	4.12	4.02	3.99	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	4	1	1	3	6	3.40	1024/1172	3.40	4.08	4.15	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	2	0	6	3	5	3.56	1063/1182	3.56	4.37	4.35	4.18	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	856/1170	4.06	4.52	4.38	4.17	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	28	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: HIST 102 01
 Title Amer Hist Since 1877
 Instructor: Smead,Howard
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 830
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	15	Under-grad	44	Non-major	43
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 103 01
 Title East-Asian Civilizatio
 Instructor: Yip,Ka-che
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 831
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	11	12	27	4.32	800/1447	4.32	4.54	4.31	4.18	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	13	27	4.28	824/1447	4.28	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	12	30	4.40	658/1241	4.40	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	27	1	0	7	7	8	3.91	1066/1402	3.91	4.42	4.24	4.15	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	11	13	23	4.14	709/1358	4.14	4.30	4.11	4.03	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	880/1316	3.94	4.33	4.14	3.99	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	6	10	33	4.55	398/1427	4.55	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	25	24	4.46	1109/1447	4.46	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	1	6	16	13	4.05	823/1434	4.05	4.34	4.10	4.10	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	8	35	4.70	521/1387	4.70	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	4	41	4.87	630/1387	4.87	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	4	15	26	4.49	635/1386	4.49	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	6	5	34	4.62	520/1380	4.62	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	3	0	10	10	16	3.92	737/1193	3.92	4.12	4.02	3.99	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	890/1172	3.73	4.08	4.15	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.37	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	1	4	0	10	4.27	757/1170	4.27	4.52	4.38	4.17	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	36	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 18	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B 17			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 20	Under-grad 51	Non-major 39
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 4			

Course-Section: HIST 110 01
 Title Western Civ To 1700
 Instructor: Birkenmeier, Joh
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 832
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	2	1	5	15	21	4.18	936/1447	4.18	4.54	4.31	4.18	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	5	17	20	4.23	882/1447	4.23	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	0	1	18	23	4.44	611/1241	4.44	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	2	5	18	17	4.05	949/1402	4.05	4.42	4.24	4.15	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	6	10	24	4.20	654/1358	4.20	4.30	4.11	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	6	8	11	16	3.83	950/1316	3.83	4.33	4.14	3.99	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	1	7	10	24	4.20	835/1427	4.20	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	3	39	4.86	592/1447	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	2	1	4	17	12	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.34	4.10	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	8	35	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	43	4.98	159/1387	4.98	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	4	9	29	4.38	775/1386	4.38	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	0	8	33	4.59	560/1380	4.59	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	3	3	7	10	19	3.93	737/1193	3.93	4.12	4.02	3.99	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	479/1172	4.38	4.08	4.15	3.95	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	400/1182	4.69	4.37	4.35	4.18	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	285/1170	4.85	4.52	4.38	4.17	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	35	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 12	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 18			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 6	General 21	Under-grad 48	Non-major 46
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 2	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: HIST 111 01
 Title Western Civ Since 1700
 Instructor: McDonough, Susan
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 833
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	19	4.43	681/1447	4.33	4.54	4.31	4.18	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	17	4.53	500/1447	4.35	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	5	22	4.59	469/1241	4.54	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	10	18	4.52	482/1402	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.15	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	12	14	4.23	626/1358	3.92	4.30	4.11	4.03	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	11	13	4.14	729/1316	3.83	4.33	4.14	3.99	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	337/1427	4.68	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	2	0	0	3	24	4.62	998/1447	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	13	10	4.22	668/1434	4.23	4.34	4.10	4.10	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	337/1387	4.72	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	0	0	26	4.75	859/1387	4.91	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	8	19	4.57	539/1386	4.56	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	0	0	5	19	4.37	783/1380	4.61	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	4	7	14	4.19	536/1193	4.31	4.12	4.02	3.99	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	593/1172	4.14	4.08	4.15	3.95	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	796/1182	4.26	4.37	4.35	4.18	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	608/1170	4.53	4.52	4.38	4.17	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	18	10	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 800	4.00	4.20	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: HIST 111 01
 Title Western Civ Since 1700
 Instructor: McDonough, Susan
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 833
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	31	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 111 02
 Title Western Civ Since 1700
 Instructor: Grubb,James S
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 834
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	11	20	4.39	742/1447	4.33	4.54	4.31	4.18	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	7	20	4.29	824/1447	4.35	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	22	4.50	541/1241	4.54	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	10	18	4.30	715/1402	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.15	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	7	7	18	4.09	756/1358	3.92	4.30	4.11	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	6	8	14	3.76	991/1316	3.83	4.33	4.14	3.99	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	25	4.58	361/1427	4.68	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	673/1447	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	4	11	10	4.15	744/1434	4.23	4.34	4.10	4.10	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	24	4.57	698/1387	4.72	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	159/1387	4.91	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	24	4.49	635/1386	4.56	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	434/1380	4.61	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	10	20	4.50	288/1193	4.31	4.12	4.02	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	3	2	6	15	4.27	573/1172	4.14	4.08	4.15	3.95	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	6	19	4.62	480/1182	4.26	4.37	4.35	4.18	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	327/1170	4.53	4.52	4.38	4.17	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	10	16	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.20	4.06	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 2	A 12	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 18	Under-grad 36 Non-major 32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	963/1447	4.33	4.54	4.31	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	872/1447	4.35	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.54	514/1241	4.54	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	314/1402	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.15	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	1191/1358	3.92	4.30	4.11	4.03	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1097/1316	3.83	4.33	4.14	3.99	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1427	4.68	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	1008/1447	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	578/1434	4.23	4.34	4.10	4.10	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	414/1387	4.72	4.73	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	4.91	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	496/1386	4.56	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1380	4.61	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	493/1193	4.31	4.12	4.02	3.99	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	6	3.92	782/1172	4.14	4.08	4.15	3.95	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	4	0	7	4.00	856/1182	4.26	4.37	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	733/1170	4.53	4.52	4.38	4.17	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	4.00	4.20	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 200 01
 Title Themes In World Histor
 Instructor: Froide, Amy M.
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 836
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	18	23	4.52	562/1447	4.26	4.54	4.31	4.31	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	12	28	4.62	413/1447	4.56	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	30	4.63	427/1241	4.71	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	28	4.53	459/1402	4.47	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	11	23	4.40	452/1358	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	7	11	22	4.38	519/1316	4.13	4.33	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	7	8	25	4.45	541/1427	4.45	4.38	4.19	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97	146/1447	4.99	4.67	4.69	4.70	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	14	18	4.43	431/1434	4.16	4.34	4.10	3.97	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	100/1387	4.91	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	39	4.93	422/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	34	4.83	229/1386	4.79	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	36	4.83	238/1380	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	6	16	14	4.00	652/1193	3.71	4.12	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	5	11	16	4.34	512/1172	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.34
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	5	24	4.59	496/1182	4.51	4.37	4.35	4.30	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	352/1170	4.60	4.52	4.38	4.32	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	3	11	5	8	3.57	637/ 800	3.71	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	16	Under-grad	43	Non-major	26
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 200 02
 Title Themes In World Histor
 Instructor: Froide, Amy M.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 837
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1058/1447	4.26	4.54	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	532/1447	4.56	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.80	231/1241	4.71	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	616/1402	4.47	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	581/1358	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	921/1316	4.13	4.33	4.14	4.08	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	541/1427	4.45	4.38	4.19	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.99	4.67	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	996/1434	4.16	4.34	4.10	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.91	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	316/1386	4.79	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	659/1380	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	991/1193	3.71	4.12	4.02	4.04	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	648/1172	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	621/1182	4.51	4.37	4.35	4.30	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	640/1170	4.60	4.52	4.38	4.32	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	537/ 800	3.71	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	42/ 66	4.60	4.77	4.58	4.43	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	26/ 62	4.83	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	49/ 58	3.83	4.29	4.41	3.79	3.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	37/ 65	4.50	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	36/ 64	4.00	3.96	4.09	3.70	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 201 01
 Title Intro To Study Of Hist
 Instructor: Lindenmeyer, Kri
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 838
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	12	17	4.29	829/1447	4.29	4.54	4.31	4.31	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	12	22	4.65	376/1447	4.65	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	774/1241	4.27	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	11	21	4.56	437/1402	4.56	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	12	13	3.91	905/1358	3.91	4.30	4.11	4.12	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	372/1316	4.53	4.33	4.14	4.08	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	247/1427	4.71	4.38	4.19	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.67	4.69	4.70	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	1	10	15	4.41	454/1434	4.41	4.34	4.10	3.97	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	230/1387	4.89	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	290/1386	4.77	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	22	4.57	582/1380	4.57	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	199/1193	4.65	4.12	4.02	4.04	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	512/1172	4.35	4.08	4.15	4.12	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	534/1182	4.54	4.37	4.35	4.30	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	327/1170	4.81	4.52	4.38	4.32	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	3	2	4	10	4.11	407/ 800	4.11	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.11
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 274 01
 Title Contemporary Jewish Hi
 Instructor: Katz,David
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 839
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	10	20	4.37	752/1447	4.37	4.54	4.31	4.31	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	6	19	4.11	983/1447	4.11	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	4	4	21	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	591/1402	4.42	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	8	18	4.18	681/1358	4.18	4.30	4.11	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	423/1316	4.47	4.33	4.14	4.08	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	2	1	8	6	14	3.94	1045/1427	3.94	4.38	4.19	4.14	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	11	8	14	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.67	4.69	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	1	1	6	8	10	3.96	902/1434	3.96	4.34	4.10	3.97	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	4	25	4.61	656/1387	4.61	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1	30	4.79	814/1387	4.79	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	4	8	18	4.28	855/1386	4.28	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	3	5	22	4.30	840/1380	4.30	4.61	4.32	4.30	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	26	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1193	****	4.12	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	5	3	0	5	3.07	1085/1172	3.07	4.08	4.15	4.12	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	963/1182	3.87	4.37	4.35	4.30	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	757/1170	4.27	4.52	4.38	4.32	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	21	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: HIST 274 01
 Title Contemporary Jewish Hi
 Instructor: Katz,David
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 839
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	18	Under-grad	36	Non-major	30
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 306 01
 Title The First World War
 Instructor: Laurie, Clayton
 Enrollment: 100
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 840
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	13	52	4.64	430/1447	4.64	4.54	4.31	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	13	53	4.70	315/1447	4.70	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	8	57	4.79	241/1241	4.79	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	5	13	47	4.51	482/1402	4.51	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	13	13	40	4.24	617/1358	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.10	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	15	46	4.51	382/1316	4.51	4.33	4.14	4.13	4.51
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	3	11	54	4.70	256/1427	4.70	4.38	4.19	4.15	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	2	0	3	62	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	1	0	2	8	44	4.71	199/1434	4.71	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	4	63	4.88	230/1387	4.88	4.73	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	64	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	12	55	4.79	265/1386	4.79	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	57	4.79	286/1380	4.79	4.61	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	3	2	12	49	4.62	211/1193	4.62	4.12	4.02	4.05	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	3	2	5	7	12	3.79	863/1172	3.79	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	2	2	10	14	4.17	781/1182	4.17	4.37	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	0	1	2	10	16	4.41	648/1170	4.41	4.52	4.38	4.49	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	43	17	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 2	A 27	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 2	B 28		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 7	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 71 Non-major 50
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 1	Electives 22	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 3		

Course-Section: HIST 355 01
 Title Selected Topics In His
 Instructor: Laurie, Clayton
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 841
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	36	4.88	179/1447	4.85	4.54	4.31	4.32	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	137/1447	4.58	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	113/1241	4.73	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	143/1402	4.61	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	216/1358	4.67	4.30	4.11	4.10	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	32	4.70	212/1316	4.61	4.33	4.14	4.13	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	36	4.90	86/1427	4.63	4.38	4.19	4.15	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	928/1447	4.79	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	0	0	3	32	4.81	117/1434	4.58	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	35	4.87	245/1387	4.84	4.73	4.46	4.44	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	34	4.87	171/1386	4.67	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	37	4.92	127/1380	4.73	4.61	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	0	6	31	4.69	168/1193	4.56	4.12	4.02	4.05	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	302/1172	4.63	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.37	4.35	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	316/1170	4.78	4.52	4.38	4.49	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	20	13	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/ 800	4.57	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	15	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	232/1447	4.85	4.54	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	814/1447	4.58	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	523/1241	4.73	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	645/1402	4.61	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	251/1358	4.67	4.30	4.11	4.10	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	372/1316	4.61	4.33	4.14	4.13	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	656/1427	4.63	4.38	4.19	4.15	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.79	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	516/1434	4.58	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1387	4.84	4.73	4.46	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	663/1386	4.67	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	626/1380	4.73	4.61	4.32	4.32	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	358/1193	4.56	4.12	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	309/1172	4.63	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	292/1182	4.82	4.37	4.35	4.42	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	390/1170	4.78	4.52	4.38	4.49	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	169/ 800	4.57	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 358 01
 Title Art & Socty: Renaissan
 Instructor: Grubb,James S
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 843
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	26	4.68	397/1447	4.68	4.54	4.31	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	12	21	4.46	604/1447	4.46	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	313/1241	4.72	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	3	14	16	4.14	882/1402	4.14	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	12	4	18	3.97	834/1358	3.97	4.30	4.11	4.10	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	3	12	17	4.17	700/1316	4.17	4.33	4.14	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	3	10	18	3.97	1002/1427	3.97	4.38	4.19	4.15	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	35	2	0	3.05	1442/1447	3.05	4.67	4.69	4.65	3.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	478/1434	4.38	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	180/1387	4.91	4.73	4.46	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	34	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	28	4.74	328/1386	4.74	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	30	4.83	250/1380	4.83	4.61	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	131/1193	4.76	4.12	4.02	4.05	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	8	6	11	4.04	698/1172	4.04	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	2	20	4.62	480/1182	4.62	4.37	4.35	4.42	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	515/1170	4.62	4.52	4.38	4.49	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	12	18	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 18		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	10
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	9	24	4.65	430/1447	4.65	4.54	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	25	4.68	339/1447	4.68	4.47	4.27	4.23	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	29	4.82	222/1241	4.82	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	26	4.59	402/1402	4.59	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	165/1358	4.76	4.30	4.11	4.10	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	11	18	4.42	476/1316	4.42	4.33	4.14	4.13	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	29	4.79	163/1427	4.79	4.38	4.19	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	146/1447	4.97	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	15	12	4.31	565/1434	4.31	4.34	4.10	4.09	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	414/1387	4.76	4.73	4.46	4.44	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	159/1387	4.97	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	171/1386	4.88	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	30	4.79	286/1380	4.79	4.61	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	8	21	4.48	305/1193	4.48	4.12	4.02	4.05	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	333/1172	4.59	4.08	4.15	4.24	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	347/1182	4.76	4.37	4.35	4.42	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	390/1170	4.76	4.52	4.38	4.49	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	2	6	19	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors		10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	22							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General		8	Under-grad	34	Non-major	27
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				

Course-Section: HIST 380 01
 Title Women/Gender In Asia
 Instructor: Vaporis,Constan
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 845
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	9	7	3.90	1159/1447	3.90	4.54	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	3	9	3.76	1224/1447	3.76	4.47	4.27	4.23	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	14	4.38	675/1241	4.38	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	5	11	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.42	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	599/1358	4.26	4.30	4.11	4.10	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	9	2	7	3.79	979/1316	3.79	4.33	4.14	4.13	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	4	1	5	8	3.79	1152/1427	3.79	4.38	4.19	4.15	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	1275/1447	4.21	4.67	4.69	4.65	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	6	6	4	3.58	1203/1434	3.58	4.34	4.10	4.09	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	5	11	4.10	1147/1387	4.10	4.73	4.46	4.44	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	4	4	9	3.86	1151/1386	3.86	4.58	4.32	4.30	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	6	6	3.62	1214/1380	3.62	4.61	4.32	4.32	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	358/1193	4.43	4.12	4.02	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1019/1172	3.43	4.08	4.15	4.24	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	1	2	7	3.79	1002/1182	3.79	4.37	4.35	4.42	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	3	0	3	8	4.14	827/1170	4.14	4.52	4.38	4.49	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	2.87	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 21	Non-major 18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	18	4.47	587/1241	4.47	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	0	9	17	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	10	18	4.43	419/1358	4.43	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	362/1316	4.53	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	3	22	4.47	513/1427	4.47	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	29	4.90	159/1380	4.90	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	1	2	4	15	4.35	414/1193	4.35	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	619/1172	4.19	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	691/1182	4.33	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	745/1170	4.29	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	10	17	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		Graduate 7
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 14	F 0		Non-major 6
			P 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	2
?	0		

Course-Section: HIST 442 01
 Title U.S.:1917 To 1945
 Instructor: Nolan,Andrew Sh
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 847
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	154/1447	4.86	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	99/1241	4.93	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	107/1358	4.87	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	70/1434	4.93	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.73	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	95/1386	4.93	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	168/1193	4.69	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	99/1172	4.93	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.37	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.52	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	1	1	7	3.83	547/ 800	3.83	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 1						

Course-Section: HIST 446 01
 Title Hist Of Sci Since 1700
 Instructor: Brown, Eric J
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 848
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	430/1447	4.71	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	814/1447	4.52	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	646/1241	4.67	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	943/1402	4.41	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	10	4.12	736/1358	4.33	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	486/1316	4.54	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	942/1427	4.34	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	978/1447	4.82	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	817/1434	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	798/1387	4.71	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	919/1387	4.82	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	719/1386	4.68	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	858/1380	4.60	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	861/1193	4.02	4.12	4.02	4.00	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	812/1172	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	750/1182	4.53	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	781/1170	4.61	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	366/ 800	4.03	4.20	4.06	4.19	4.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 446 02
 Title Hist Of Sci Since 1700
 Instructor: Nolan, Andrew Sh
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 849
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	298/1447	4.71	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1447	4.52	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1241	4.67	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	207/1402	4.41	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	325/1358	4.33	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	239/1316	4.54	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	328/1427	4.34	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.82	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	79/1434	4.49	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	160/1387	4.71	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.82	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	109/1386	4.68	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1380	4.60	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	440/1193	4.02	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	333/1172	4.24	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1182	4.53	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1170	4.61	4.52	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	537/ 800	4.03	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.86

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 447 01
 Title History Of Civil Right
 Instructor: Smead,Howard
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 850
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	320/1447	4.74	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	413/1447	4.61	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	292/1241	4.74	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	518/1402	4.48	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	5	7	15	4.13	718/1358	4.13	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	7	16	4.27	608/1316	4.27	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	5	6	18	4.45	541/1427	4.45	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	19	10	4.30	1223/1447	4.30	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	10	15	4.48	363/1434	4.48	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	684/1387	4.59	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	369/1387	4.93	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	353/1386	4.72	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	250/1380	4.83	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	1119/1193	2.89	4.12	4.02	4.00	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	824/1172	3.87	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	415/1170	4.73	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	17	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 1	Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 31	Non-major 18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 2			

Course-Section: HIST 456 01
 Title The Roman Empire
 Instructor: Phin, Timothy J
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 851
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	59/1447	4.96	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	179/1447	4.82	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	113/1241	4.93	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	259/1402	4.72	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	21	4.61	280/1358	4.61	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	292/1316	4.61	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	22	4.68	274/1427	4.68	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	388/1447	4.93	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	149/1434	4.76	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	80/1387	4.96	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	170/1380	4.89	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	0	2	23	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	3	2	8	3.75	881/1172	3.75	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	732/1182	4.27	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	156/1170	4.94	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: HIST 456 01
 Title The Roman Empire
 Instructor: Phin, Timothy J
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 851
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	27	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	31	4.81	243/1447	4.81	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	29	4.73	281/1447	4.73	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	7	28	4.69	345/1241	4.69	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	10	23	4.56	437/1402	4.56	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	194/1358	4.72	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	5	24	4.49	413/1316	4.49	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.49
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	5	26	4.54	410/1427	4.54	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	9	19	4.52	334/1434	4.52	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	230/1387	4.89	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	159/1387	4.97	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	353/1386	4.72	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	95/1380	4.94	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	3	8	20	4.36	401/1193	4.36	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	6	4	11	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	612/1182	4.43	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	6	2	14	4.26	757/1170	4.26	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	14	16	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors		16	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General		2	Under-grad	37	Non-major	17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives		12	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	654/1447	4.45	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	14	5	4.09	999/1447	4.09	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	7	4.05	949/1402	4.05	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	14	4.27	590/1358	4.27	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	9	6	3.77	985/1316	3.77	4.33	4.14	4.27	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	7	9	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	15	3	3.91	1405/1447	3.91	4.67	4.69	4.72	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	634/1434	4.25	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	741/1387	4.55	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	630/1387	4.86	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	784/1386	4.36	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	506/1380	4.64	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	7	14	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1024/1172	3.40	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	915/1182	3.93	4.37	4.35	4.49	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	6	7	4.13	833/1170	4.13	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	666/ 800	3.46	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.46
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 11
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Electives 4
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 473 01
 Title 20Th C Britain
 Instructor: Ritschel, Daniel
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 854
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	6	3	15	4.28	839/1447	4.28	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	8	10	3.96	1088/1447	3.96	4.47	4.27	4.31	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1077/1241	3.73	4.56	4.33	4.41	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	4	14	4.08	923/1402	4.08	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	777/1358	4.04	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	608/1316	4.26	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	5	9	7	3.83	1123/1427	3.83	4.38	4.19	4.20	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	646/1447	4.84	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	11	5	3.90	983/1434	3.90	4.34	4.10	4.17	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	630/1387	4.87	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	2	7	12	4.17	953/1386	4.17	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	3	17	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	6	7	7	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.12	4.02	4.00	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	5	1	6	3.35	1037/1172	3.35	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	4	4	7	3.82	985/1182	3.82	4.37	4.35	4.49	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	4	1	7	3.47	1079/1170	3.47	4.52	4.38	4.51	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	8	16	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12	Graduate	1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	Under-grad	25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	5
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		0

Course-Section: HIST 479 01
 Title China, 1912 To 1949
 Instructor: Oakes,Julie Chr
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 855
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	376/1447	4.64	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	404/1241	4.64	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	336/1402	4.64	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	151/1358	4.79	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	739/1427	4.29	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	611/1434	4.27	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	491/1380	4.64	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	12	4.57	243/1193	4.57	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	411/1172	4.46	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	480/1182	4.62	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	377/1170	4.77	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	81/ 800	4.89	4.20	4.06	4.19	4.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: HIST 480 01
 Title Contemp China Since 19
 Instructor: Yip,Ka-che
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 856
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	640/1447	4.46	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1447	4.31	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	439/1241	4.62	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1088/1402	3.89	4.42	4.24	4.34	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	893/1358	3.92	4.30	4.11	4.15	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	962/1316	3.82	4.33	4.14	4.27	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	716/1427	4.31	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1109/1447	4.46	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	802/1434	4.09	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	616/1193	4.09	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1067/1172	3.20	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1053/1182	3.60	4.37	4.35	4.49	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1032/1170	3.60	4.52	4.38	4.51	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: HIST 487 01
 Title Europe, 1815-1914
 Instructor: Campbell,Dougla
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 857
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	201/1447	4.86	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	251/1241	4.79	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	143/1316	4.79	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	120/1427	4.86	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	388/1447	4.93	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.93	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1380	4.93	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	559/1172	4.29	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	508/1182	4.57	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	352/1170	4.79	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	537/ 800	3.86	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: HIST 494 01
 Title Seminar In World Histo
 Instructor: McDonough,Susan
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 858
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.56	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.30	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1316	4.83	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	866/1427	4.17	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	811/1386	4.33	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	959/1380	4.17	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1188/1193	1.00	4.12	4.02	4.00	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.08	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.37	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	28/ 66	4.83	4.77	4.58	4.87	4.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	26/ 62	4.83	4.72	4.56	4.80	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	19/ 58	4.83	4.29	4.41	4.59	4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 65	4.50	4.09	4.42	4.55	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	33/ 64	4.17	3.96	4.09	4.43	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 1 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 495 01
 Title Seminar In Amer Histor
 Instructor: Bedi,Joyce E. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 859
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	989/1447	4.13	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	485/1358	4.38	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1259/1427	3.50	4.38	4.19	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1036/1447	4.57	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	262/1434	4.31	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.58	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	431/1386	4.58	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.58	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.37	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.52	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.20	4.06	4.19	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	39/ 66	4.71	4.77	4.58	4.87	4.71
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	38/ 62	4.71	4.72	4.56	4.80	4.71
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	45/ 58	4.14	4.29	4.41	4.59	4.14
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	57/ 65	3.71	4.09	4.42	4.55	3.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	49/ 64	3.57	3.96	4.09	4.43	3.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 495 01
 Title Seminar In Amer Histor
 Instructor: Tatarewicz,Jose (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 860
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	989/1447	4.13	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.56	4.33	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	485/1358	4.38	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	549/1316	4.33	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1259/1427	3.50	4.38	4.19	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1036/1447	4.57	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	849/1434	4.31	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1387	4.58	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1386	4.58	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	659/1380	4.58	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.37	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.52	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.20	4.06	4.19	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	39/ 66	4.71	4.77	4.58	4.87	4.71
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	38/ 62	4.71	4.72	4.56	4.80	4.71
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	45/ 58	4.14	4.29	4.41	4.59	4.14
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	57/ 65	3.71	4.09	4.42	4.55	3.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	49/ 64	3.57	3.96	4.09	4.43	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		6
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 496 01
 Title Historical Research
 Instructor: Tatarewicz,Jose
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 861
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	790/1447	4.33	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.56	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	312/1316	4.58	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	988/1447	4.64	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	503/1434	4.36	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	902/1387	4.40	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1104/1380	3.90	4.61	4.32	4.34	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	340/1193	4.44	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1042/1172	3.33	4.08	4.15	4.25	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	979/1182	3.83	4.37	4.35	4.49	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.62	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 497 01
 Title Historical Research
 Instructor: Froide, Amy M.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 862
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	342/1447	4.73	4.54	4.31	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	112/1447	4.90	4.47	4.27	4.31	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.56	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	249/1402	4.73	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	663/1358	4.20	4.30	4.11	4.15	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	76/1316	4.91	4.33	4.14	4.27	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	1054/1447	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	206/1434	4.70	4.34	4.10	4.17	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.73	4.46	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	392/1386	4.70	4.58	4.32	4.34	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	840/1380	4.30	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.12	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.37	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1170	4.88	4.52	4.38	4.51	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.20	4.06	4.19	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.77	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.72	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.29	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.09	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.96	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: HIST 701 01
 Title Study Of History
 Instructor: Lindenmeyer, Kri
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 863
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.54	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.56	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1022/1358	3.75	4.30	4.11	4.26	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.33	4.14	4.34	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1427	4.25	4.38	4.19	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.34	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.73	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	131/1193	4.75	4.12	4.02	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.37	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.52	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.20	4.06	4.10	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 2	Major 1	
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 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	386/1447	4.69	4.54	4.31	4.46	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	327/1447	4.69	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.56	4.33	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	459/1402	4.53	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	107/1358	4.87	4.30	4.11	4.26	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	434/1316	4.47	4.33	4.14	4.34	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.38	4.19	4.25	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.67	4.69	4.74	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	246/1434	4.64	4.34	4.10	4.21	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.73	4.46	4.51	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1386	4.78	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.12	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1172	4.88	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	138/1182	4.94	4.37	4.35	4.46	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	156/1170	4.94	4.52	4.38	4.52	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.10	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.77	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.72	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	4.29	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	4.09	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.09	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7	Graduate	2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	15
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	0

Course-Section: HIST 710 01
 Title Seminar In Pol. Histor
 Instructor: Laurie, Clayton
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 865
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.54	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.56	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.33	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.38	4.19	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.34	4.10	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	307/1387	4.83	4.73	4.46	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.92	4.73	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	895/1193	3.67	4.12	4.02	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.37	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.52	4.38	4.52	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	4.77	4.58	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 62	4.50	4.72	4.56	4.69	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 58	4.50	4.29	4.41	4.75	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	53/ 65	4.00	4.09	4.42	4.64	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	23/ 64	4.50	3.96	4.09	4.18	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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