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

           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    3   0  1  1  22  33  67  4.32  866/1674  4.22  4.23  4.27  4.07  4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  1  6  17  47  53  4.17 1026/1674  4.14  4.18  4.23  4.16  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   1  3  4  15  42  59  4.22  878/1423  4.16  4.23  4.27  4.16  4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3  85  1  3   5  14  16  4.05 1061/1609  3.91  4.23  4.22  4.05  4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   4  2  4  25  30  58  4.16  652/1585  4.17  4.03  3.96  3.88  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 99  0  3   8   0  13  3.96 ****/1535  3.86  4.06  4.08  3.89  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0  1  1   7   7 107  4.77  208/1651  4.50  4.24  4.18  4.10  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   1  0  0   1  58  63  4.51 1203/1673  4.60  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 21 2  1  1  19  49  34  4.10  900/1656  4.17  4.01  4.07  3.96  4.10


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  0  0   8  27  89  4.65  678/1586  4.63  4.38  4.43  4.37  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  0  0   4   9 111  4.86  664/1585  4.80  4.60  4.69  4.60  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  14  37  73  4.48  675/1582  4.39  4.26  4.26  4.17  4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   3  0  4  15  23  79  4.46  742/1575  4.45  4.29  4.27  4.17  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2  2  4  10  30  76  4.43  363/1380  4.29  3.96  3.94  3.78  4.43


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 41  0 12  7  28  13  26  3.40 1225/1520  3.59  4.03  4.01  3.76  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 41  0  4  6  17  27  32  3.90 1141/1515  3.78  4.27  4.24  3.97  3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 41 0  3  4  13  25  41  4.13 1004/1511  4.21  4.27  4.27  4.00  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                   41 64  2  5   5   4   6  3.32 ****/ 994  3.27  3.75  3.94  3.73  ****


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  110 13  0  0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 116 0  1  0   2   2   6  4.09 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 116 6  0  0   1   0   4  4.60 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            116 6  0  1   1   1   2  3.80 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  117 6  0  0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.00  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 117 6  0  0   2   0   2  4.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 119 4  0  0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 119 5  0  0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     119 4  0  0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 119 4  0  0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.69  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  118 0  1  0   3   1   4  3.78 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  119 0  0  0   2   2   4  4.25 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        118 3  0  1   1   0   4  4.17 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    118 4  0  0   1   1   3  4.40 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  118 4  0  0   2   0   3  4.20 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.30  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 117 0  0  0   2   3   5  4.30 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     116 1  0  1   1   4   4  4.10 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       117 5  0  0   2   0   3  4.20 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        116 5  2  1   1   0   2  2.83 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      117 4  2  0   1   0   3  3.33 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 100  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page 1381
Title           INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY                  Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     FREIBERG, KAREN                        Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     182
Questionnaires: 127                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    31       0.00-0.99    9        A   25      Required for Majors  57     Graduate    0      Major        2
 28-55     7       1.00-1.99    1        B   49
 56-83     5       2.00-2.99    5        C   22      General              16     Under-grad  127    Non-major  125
 84-150    1       3.00-3.49    1        D    3
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    7        F    2      Electives             3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                28
                                         ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 100  0201            University of Maryland                                  Page 1382
Title       INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY           Baltimore County                                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SPIEGELMAN, JAS                  Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     174
Questionnaires: 120                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	3	13	37	64	4.38	792/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	15	34	65	4.39	763/1674	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.16	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	7	37	68	4.43	672/1423	4.16	4.23	4.27	4.16	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	64	0	1	13	22	17	4.04	1074/1609	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	4	19	43	49	4.16	642/1585	4.17	4.03	3.96	3.88	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	95	0	1	5	7	6	3.95	****/1535	3.86	4.06	4.08	3.89	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	8	21	87	4.65	351/1651	4.50	4.24	4.18	4.10	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	51	64	4.56	1169/1673	4.60	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	1	2	24	72	4.69	239/1656	4.17	4.01	4.07	3.96	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	20	97	4.83	354/1586	4.63	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	11	106	4.91	567/1585	4.80	4.60	4.69	4.60	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	27	83	4.68	423/1582	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.17	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	23	90	4.72	423/1575	4.45	4.29	4.27	4.17	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	2	3	10	34	60	4.35	419/1380	4.29	3.96	3.94	3.78	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	9	15	35	43	3.98	832/1520	3.59	4.03	4.01	3.76	3.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	6	14	32	50	4.14	971/1515	3.78	4.27	4.24	3.97	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	2	9	24	69	4.44	718/1511	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.00	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	15	72	6	4	5	8	10	3.36	799/ 994	3.27	3.75	3.94	3.73	3.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	34	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 265	****	4.18	4.23	3.97	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	12	0	3	3	3	2.29	****/ 278	****	4.43	4.19	3.97	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	94	24	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 260	****	4.45	4.46	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	96	22	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.60	4.33	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	96	22	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.00	4.20	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	89	19	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	93	24	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.58	4.48	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	91	27	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	93	18	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	****/ 99	****	4.41	4.39	4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	94	20	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.02	4.14	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	105	0	7	2	2	3	1	2.27	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	105	0	7	0	2	2	4	2.73	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	103	13	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	103	14	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	103	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	103	0	5	2	2	3	5	3.06	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	99	12	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	100	11	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	101	16	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	101	16	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****

```
                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA           Expected Grades              Reasons                   Type                       Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    43         0.00-0.99    5         A    39       Required for Majors  54       Graduate      0        Major         9
  28-55     7         1.00-1.99    1         B    52
  56-83     5         2.00-2.99    3         C    18       General              22       Under-grad  120        Non-major   111
  84-150    3         3.00-3.49    4         D     3
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   10         F     0       Electives            14       #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P     0                                     responses to be significant
                                             I     0       Other                28
                                             ?     3
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 100  0301                    University of Maryland                                Page 1383
Title       INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY                      Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   O'BRIEN, EILEEN                          Fall   2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    182
Questionnaires: 101                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                      NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   5   0   3   6  16  35  36  3.99 1221/1674  4.22  4.23  4.27  4.07  3.99
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    5   0   4   4  17  34  37  4.00 1146/1674  4.14  4.18  4.23  4.16  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   6   1   3   5  20  24  42  4.03  998/1423  4.16  4.23  4.27  4.16  4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    5  44   4   4   9  19  16  3.75 1320/1609  3.91  4.23  4.22  4.05  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6   8   1   5  13  28  40  4.16  642/1585  4.17  4.03  3.96  3.88  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 60  0   5   8  10  13  3.86 1057/1535  3.86  4.06  4.08  3.89  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            5   0   3   7  12  29  45  4.10 1031/1651  4.50  4.24  4.18  4.10  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5   2   1   2   0   1  90  4.88  742/1673  4.60  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 1  3   4  17  43  15  3.77 1230/1656  4.17  4.01  4.07  3.96  3.77

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   1   1   7  19  68  4.58  774/1586  4.63  4.38  4.43  4.37  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0   1   1   4  20  68  4.63 1118/1585  4.80  4.60  4.69  4.60  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0   0   3  11  30  50  4.35  829/1582  4.39  4.26  4.26  4.17  4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   1   6   1  10  21  55  4.27  949/1575  4.45  4.29  4.27  4.17  4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 0   3   0   8  16  66  4.53  290/1380  4.29  3.96  3.94  3.78  4.53

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 53 0   9   2   8  12  17  3.54 1153/1520  3.59  4.03  4.01  3.76  3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 54 0   6   5  11   8  17  3.53 1294/1515  3.78  4.27  4.24  3.97  3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 55 0  2   2  11   9  22  4.02 1043/1511  4.21  4.27  4.27  4.00  4.02
4. Were special techniques successful                  56  12   4   3   8  10   8  3.45  758/ 994  3.27  3.75  3.94  3.73  3.45

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  93   5   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  3.97  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 96 0  1   0   2   0   2  3.40 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  3.97  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 96 2  0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46  4.41  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           96   1   0   0   3   0   1  3.50 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33  4.19  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 97   1   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.00  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 96  2   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.33  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 97 1  0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.18  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 97  1   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.99  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    97   1   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.10  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                97   1   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.69  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 97   0   1   0   2   0   1  3.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.32  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 98   0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.42  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       97   1   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   97   1   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 97   1   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.30  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 97  0   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.87  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    97   0   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.91  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      97   1   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.39  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       97   1   0   1   1   0   1  3.33 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.92  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     97   0   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  3.88  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 100  0301              University of Maryland                    Page 1383
Title           INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY          Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     O'BRIEN, EILEEN              Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     182
Questionnaires: 101                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    26      0.00-0.99    3       A    29        Required for Majors  50      Graduate    1      Major        5
28-55    10      1.00-1.99    1       B    36
56-83     4      2.00-2.99   10       C    19        General              10      Under-grad  100    Non-major    96
84-150    5      3.00-3.49    8       D     1
Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   15       F     1        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P     1                                     responses to be significant
                                      I     0        Other                27
                                      ?     1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 100  0401           University of Maryland                    Page 1384
Title     INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY            Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MIRON, CHARLES              Fall  2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   161
Questionnaires: 99                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean  Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0  1  5 16 30 45 4.16 1056/1674 4.22 4.23 4.27 4.07 4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  1  8 17 34 38 4.02 1132/1674 4.14 4.18 4.23 4.16 4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  2  8 21 29 38 3.95 1070/1423 4.16 4.23 4.27 4.16 3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  71  2  0 10  3 11 3.81 1285/1609 3.91 4.23 4.22 4.05 3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  1  2 18 31 43 4.19  622/1585 4.17 4.03 3.96 3.88 4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 80 6 3  2  2  4 2.71 ****/1535 3.86 4.06 4.08 3.89 ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  2  3  6 21 66 4.49  553/1651 4.50 4.24 4.18 4.10 4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   2  1  0  4 41 50 4.45 1267/1673 4.60 4.63 4.69 4.67 4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 3 0 4 11 36 31 4.15 849/1656 4.17 4.01 4.07 3.96 4.15


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  0  5  8 21 60 4.45  945/1586 4.63 4.38 4.43 4.37 4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  5  7 83 4.82  762/1585 4.80 4.60 4.69 4.60 4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  3  4 14 37 37 4.06 1099/1582 4.39 4.26 4.26 4.17 4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   2  3  3  7 26 53 4.34  886/1575 4.45 4.29 4.27 4.17 4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  9  6  9 15 18 38 3.85  838/1380 4.29 3.96 3.94 3.78 3.85


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 29 0 14 5 13 13 25 3.43 1210/1520 3.59 4.03 4.01 3.76 3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 28 0 11 5 11 21 23 3.56 1285/1515 3.78 4.27 4.24 3.97 3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 28 0 2 2  9 20 38 4.27  886/1511 4.21 4.27 4.27 4.00 4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                  28  38  8  6  6  4  9 3.00  881/ 994 3.27 3.75 3.94 3.73 3.00


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  71  23  1  0  1  1  2 3.60 ****/ 265 **** 4.18 4.23 3.97 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 80 0 6 2  0  4  7 3.21 ****/ 278 **** 4.43 4.19 3.97 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 81 15 0 0  0  0  3 5.00 ****/ 260 **** 4.45 4.46 4.41 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           81  14  1  0  0  0  3 4.00 ****/ 259 **** 4.60 4.33 4.19 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 81  15  0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/ 233 **** 3.00 4.20 4.00 ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 72 17 0 0  1  1  8 4.70 ****/ 103 **** 4.50 4.41 4.33 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 79 14 0 1  1  0  4 4.17 ****/ 101 **** 4.58 4.48 4.18 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 80 14 0 0  2  1  2 4.00 ****/  95 **** 4.15 4.31 3.99 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    81  13  0  0  2  1  2 4.00 ****/  99 **** 4.41 4.39 4.10 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                79  14  0  0  0  1  5 4.83 ****/  97 **** 4.02 4.14 3.69 ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 84  0  5  1  4  0  5 2.93 ****/  76 **** **** 3.98 3.32 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 85  0  1  1  2  3  7 4.00 ****/  77 **** **** 3.93 3.42 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       83  9  0  1  1  2  3 4.00 ****/  53 **** **** 4.45 4.34 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   83  7  0  2  4  1  2 3.33 ****/  48 **** **** 4.12 4.00 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 84  10  1  0  1  1  2 3.60 ****/  49 **** **** 4.27 4.30 ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 82 0  3  1  3  5  5 3.47 ****/  61 **** **** 4.09 3.87 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    81  9  0  0  3  3  3 4.00 ****/  52 **** **** 4.26 3.91 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      81  8  2  0  2  3  3 3.50 ****/  50 **** **** 4.44 4.39 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       81  12  0  1  0  2  3 4.17 ****/  35 **** **** 4.36 3.92 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     81  14  0  0  0  0  4 5.00 ****/  31 **** **** 4.34 3.88 ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   15   0.00-0.99   2   A   8   Required for Majors 41   Graduate   0   Major   0
  28-55   9   1.00-1.99   0   B   36
  56-83   4   2.00-2.99   4   C   26   General   13   Under-grad 99   Non-major   99
  84-150   4   3.00-3.49   8   D   0
  Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   6   F   1   Electives   7   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0   responses to be significant
                                         I   0   Other   14
                                         ?   3

```
Course-Section: PSYC 200  0101             University of Maryland                          Page 1385
Title          CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS       Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    SCHULTZ, DAVID               Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    78
Questionnaires: 51                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  1  1 18 31  4.55  558/1674  4.54  4.23  4.27 4.32  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  4 16 30  4.52  554/1674  4.57  4.18  4.23 4.26  4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  3 14 34  4.61  459/1423  4.65  4.23  4.27 4.36  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  25  0  2  5  3 16  4.27  839/1609  4.36  4.23  4.22 4.23  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  0 10 40  4.80  136/1585  4.43  4.03  3.96 3.91  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 35 2 0 1 2 11  4.25  667/1535  4.24  4.06  4.08 4.03  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  2 11 38  4.71  288/1651  4.66  4.24  4.18 4.20  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   1  0  0  0 15 34  4.69 1040/1673  4.47  4.63  4.69 4.67  4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1 0 0 6 19 15  4.22  757/1656  4.29  4.01  4.07 4.10  4.22

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  1 12 38  4.73  560/1586  4.80  4.38  4.43 4.48  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  1  6 42  4.84  737/1585  4.83  4.60  4.69 4.76  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  2 12 35  4.67  423/1582  4.72  4.26  4.26 4.35  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  1  3 11 35  4.60  579/1575  4.67  4.29  4.27 4.39  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 2 10 38  4.72  167/1380  4.62  3.96  3.94 4.03  4.72

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 1 0 2 11 20  4.44  466/1520  4.24  4.03  4.01 4.03  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 6 4 23  4.52  620/1515  4.26  4.27  4.24 4.28  4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 0 2 2 30  4.82  335/1511  4.60  4.27  4.27 4.28  4.82
4. Were special techniques successful                 17  13  4  2  5  3  7  3.33  811/ 994  3.72  3.75  3.94 3.98  3.33

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 46   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23 4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 48 0 0 0 0 0 3  5.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19 4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 47 3 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46 4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          47   2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33 4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 47  2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20 4.48  ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 46 2 0 0 0 0 3  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41 4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 46 2 0 0 0 0 3  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48 4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 47 3 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   47   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39 4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               47   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14 4.63  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 47 0 1 0 0 0 3  4.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98 3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 48 0 1 0 0 0 2  3.67 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93 4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      48   0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  48   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 48  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.82  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 46 0 0 0 1 1 3  4.40 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09 4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   47   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26 4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     47   0  1  0  0  0  3  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44 4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      47   0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    47   1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 4.50  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	51	Non-major	36
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: PSYC 200  0201            University of Maryland                                    Page 1386
Title       CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS        Baltimore County                                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    HANE, AMIE M.              Fall   2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      93
Questionnaires: 42                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   5  14  23  4.43  735/1674  4.54  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2  12  28  4.62  446/1674  4.57  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   2   1  12  27  4.52  551/1423  4.65  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   3   1   0   4   8  26  4.49  521/1609  4.36  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   6  15  20  4.34  472/1585  4.43  4.03  3.96  3.91  4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0   1   5  14  19  4.31  608/1535  4.24  4.06  4.08  4.03  4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   0   5   9  27  4.54  484/1651  4.66  4.24  4.18  4.20  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   4  37   1  3.93 1612/1673  4.47  4.63  4.69  4.67  3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  1   0   2  18  16  4.30  667/1656  4.29  4.01  4.07  4.10  4.30

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0   0   1   7  33  4.78  431/1586  4.80  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   0   2  39  4.95  284/1585  4.83  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   1   8  32  4.76  313/1582  4.72  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1   0   0   1  10  29  4.70  453/1575  4.67  4.29  4.27  4.39  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   1   4   6  30  4.59  253/1380  4.62  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.59

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  0   1   5   8  13  4.22  673/1520  4.24  4.03  4.01  4.03  4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  1   2   4   9  11  4.00 1024/1515  4.26  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  2   2   6  17  4.41  751/1511  4.60  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.41
4. Were special techniques successful                15  20   2   2   0   2   1  2.71 ****/ 994  3.72  3.75  3.94  3.98  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 39 0  0  0   1   0   2  4.33 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.36  ****

            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 39 2  0  0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 39 2  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   39   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               39   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  4.63  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0  0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0  0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      39   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  39   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 39 2  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0  0  0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   38   1   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     38   1   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      38   2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    38   2   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    4         0.00-0.99   0        A    12        Required for Majors  14    Graduate    1        Major      10
 28-55    3         1.00-1.99   0        B    15                                                        
 56-83    5         2.00-2.99   3        C     7        General               5    Under-grad  41       Non-major  32
 84-150   2         3.00-3.49   3        D     0                                                        
 Grad.    1         3.50-4.00   6        F     0        Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P     0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I     0        Other                13
                                         ?     1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 200  0301           University of Maryland                           Page 1387
Title       CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS         Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  KATENKAMP, ANGE                Fall  2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     85
Questionnaires: 50                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3  13  34  4.62   458/1674  4.54  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1  12  37  4.72   314/1674  4.57  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   8  39  4.72   310/1423  4.65  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   6   0   3   7  13  20  4.16   963/1609  4.36  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   4   0   2   5  15  23  4.31   502/1585  4.43  4.03  3.96  3.91  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6   3   2   6  20  13  3.86  1057/1535  4.24  4.06  4.08  4.03  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   0  14  35  4.66   330/1651  4.66  4.24  4.18  4.20  4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   1  48  4.98   212/1673  4.47  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9  2  1  0   7  16  15  4.13   871/1656  4.29  4.01  4.07  4.10  4.13


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   8  42  4.84   319/1586  4.80  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   7  42  4.82   762/1585  4.83  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   0  10  38  4.73   339/1582  4.72  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1  15  34  4.66   495/1575  4.67  4.29  4.27  4.39  4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  5  0   1   2   8  32  4.65   207/1380  4.62  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.65


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24  0  1   2   4   8  11  4.00   810/1520  4.24  4.03  4.01  4.03  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23  0  2   1   5   8  11  3.93  1114/1515  4.26  4.27  4.24  4.28  3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0  2   0   4   3  18  4.30   855/1511  4.60  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.30
4. Were special techniques successful                  24  22  0   0   1   0   3  4.50  ****/ 994  3.72  3.75  3.94  3.98  ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  4.34  ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 49  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 49 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 49  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  4.63  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 49  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     49   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      5      0.00-0.99    0      A   32      Required for Majors   8    Graduate     0     Major        21
 28-55      8      1.00-1.99    0      B   10
 56-83      7      2.00-2.99    5      C    0      General               5    Under-grad  50     Non-major    29
 84-150     4      3.00-3.49    9      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    9      F    0      Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                27
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 200  0401            University of Maryland                              Page 1388
Title       CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS         Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  BEVANS, KATHERI               Fall  2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     75
Questionnaires:  21                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  1  7 13  4.57  521/1674  4.54  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  2  8 11  4.43  705/1674  4.57  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  5 16  4.76  250/1423  4.65  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0 10 11  4.52  466/1609  4.36  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  1  1  1  5 11  4.26  548/1585  4.43  4.03  3.96  3.91  4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1  0  0  1  6 11  4.56  328/1535  4.24  4.06  4.08  4.03  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3  0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  265/1651  4.66  4.24  4.18  4.20  4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4  0  0  0  0 12  5  4.29 1390/1673  4.47  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1  0  0  1  7 10  4.50  381/1656  4.29  4.01  4.07  4.10  4.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  3 17  4.85  301/1586  4.80  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  6 14  4.70 1035/1585  4.83  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  353/1582  4.72  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  0  0  0  5 14  4.74  391/1575  4.67  4.29  4.27  4.39  4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  1  1  4 13  4.53  290/1380  4.62  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.53


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  5  2 10  4.29  607/1520  4.24  4.03  4.01  4.03  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  1  5 11  4.59  560/1515  4.26  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  0  2 15  4.88  266/1511  4.60  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  8  0  1  2  1  5  4.11  438/ 994  3.72  3.75  3.94  3.98  4.11


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   18 2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 1  0  0  1  1  3.33 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33  4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.48  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 1 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  4.63  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  19 0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  19 0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    19 1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      19 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: PSYC 205  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1389
Title        BEFORE WE WERE BORN             Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  FREIBERG, KAREN                   Fall   2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 19                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    3   0  0  1  1  1  13  4.63   458/1674  4.63   4.23  4.27 4.32  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3   0  0  1  0  5  10  4.50   578/1674  4.50   4.18  4.23 4.26  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    3   0  0  0  2  4  10  4.50   575/1423  4.50   4.23  4.27 4.36  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3   0  1  0  0  6   9  4.38   687/1609  4.38   4.23  4.22 4.23  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  1  2  13  4.75   167/1585  4.75   4.03  3.96 3.91  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 2  2  0  1  5   6  3.93   991/1535  3.93   4.06  4.08 4.03  3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  1  0  0  4  11  4.50   524/1651  4.50   4.24  4.18 4.20  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0  4  12  4.75   958/1673  4.75   4.63  4.69 4.67  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 1  0  8   3  4.08   906/1656  4.08   4.01  4.07 4.10  4.08


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         5   0  1  0  0  5   8  4.36  1054/1586  4.36   4.38  4.43 4.48  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0  0  0  0  1  13  4.93   453/1585  4.93   4.60  4.69 4.76  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0  0  1  0  4   9  4.50   632/1582  4.50   4.26  4.26 4.35  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0  0  1  0  2  11  4.64   523/1575  4.64   4.29  4.27 4.39  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  0  0  0  0  1  13  4.93    63/1380  4.93   3.96  3.94 4.03  4.93


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  3  1   4  4.13   760/1520  4.13   4.03  4.01 4.03  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  3  3   3  4.00  1024/1515  4.00   4.27  4.24 4.28  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0  0  3  1   4  4.13  1004/1511  4.13   4.27  4.27 4.28  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  7  0  0  1  0   0  3.00  ****/ 994  ****   3.75  3.94 3.98  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 210  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1390
Title       PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING       Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RICHMAN, DAVID             Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     78
Questionnaires: 33                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                        NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   1   1   3   8  19  4.34  841/1674   3.79  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   1   0   3   5  23  4.53  542/1674   4.33  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   1   0   4   6  21  4.44  660/1423   4.24  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  20   1   1   1   2   7  4.08 1042/1609   4.01  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2   2   4   6   9   9  3.63 1142/1585   3.73  4.03  3.96  3.91  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 25   0   0   1   2   3  4.33 ****/1535   3.75  4.06  4.08  4.03  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   1   0   0  30  4.90  116/1651   4.27  4.24  4.18  4.20  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   1  28   3  4.06 1541/1673   4.53  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   0   0   3  16   9  4.21  770/1656   3.68  4.01  4.07  4.10  4.21

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   1  30  4.97   86/1586   4.55  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   0  31  5.00    1/1585   4.91  4.60  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   0   6  24  4.80  246/1582   4.31  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0   0   0   4  26  4.87  214/1575   4.30  4.29  4.27  4.39  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  4   0   0   1   9  16  4.58  259/1380   4.38  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.58

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0   1   2   2   5   8  3.94  878/1520   3.62  4.03  4.01  4.03  3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0   1   0   5   3   9  4.06 1008/1515   3.85  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0   1   0   3   1  13  4.39  769/1511   4.02  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.39
4. Were special techniques successful                   15 13   3   1   0   0   1  2.00 ****/ 994   ****  3.75  3.94  3.98  ****

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 265   ****  4.18  4.23  4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 278   ****  4.43  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 260   ****  4.45  4.46  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 259   ****  4.60  4.33  4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 233   ****  3.00  4.20  4.48  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 103   ****  4.50  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 101   ****  4.58  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  95   ****  4.15  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  99   ****  4.41  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  97   ****  4.02  4.14  4.63  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  76   ****  ****  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  77   ****  ****  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  53   ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  48   ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  49   ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  61   ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  52   ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  50   ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  35   ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      32  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  31   ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 210  0101          University of Maryland                      Page 1390
Title        PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING          Baltimore County                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RICHMAN, DAVID                 Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    78
Questionnaires: 33                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0      A   12      Required for Majors   3      Graduate     0      Major        20
 28-55     4        1.00-1.99   0      B   13
 56-83     4        2.00-2.99   6      C    4      General               2      Under-grad  33      Non-major    13
 84-150    9        3.00-3.49   9      D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   8      F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                24
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 210  0201            University of Maryland                        Page 1391
Title      PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING         Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   CATANIA, A. CHA             Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    62
Questionnaires: 22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  3  4  4  7  4  3.23 1590/1674  3.79  4.23  4.27  4.32  3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  3  9  9  4.14 1051/1674  4.33  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  1  4  6 10  4.05  992/1423  4.24  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   6  1  1  1  8  5  3.94 1185/1609  4.01  4.23  4.22  4.23  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  3  2  1  6 10  3.82  996/1585  3.73  4.03  3.96  3.91  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  1  2  1  3  5  3.75 1147/1535  3.75  4.06  4.08  4.03  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  4  1  2  7  8  3.64 1390/1651  4.27  4.24  4.18  4.20  3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   2  0  0  0  0 20  5.00    1/1673  4.53  4.63  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  4  2  3 11  1  3.14 1513/1656  3.68  4.01  4.07  4.10  3.14

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  4  0  7 11  4.14 1230/1586  4.55  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  1  2 19  4.82  786/1585  4.91  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  3  3  7  8  3.82 1266/1582  4.31  4.26  4.26  4.35  3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  4  1  2  5 10  3.73 1304/1575  4.30  4.29  4.27  4.39  3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  2  2  8 10  4.18  549/1380  4.38  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.18

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  3  1  4  1  5  3.29 1273/1520  3.62  4.03  4.01  4.03  3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  2  1  2  4  5  3.64 1260/1515  3.85  4.27  4.24  4.28  3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  1  2  3  3  5  3.64 1274/1511  4.02  4.27  4.27  4.28  3.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  10  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  3.98  ****
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A   11      Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0       Major      13
 28-55     3      1.00-1.99   0        B    6                                
 56-83     5      2.00-2.99   4        C    2      General              0    Under-grad  22       Non-major   9
 84-150    5      3.00-3.49   1        D    0                                
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   8        F    0      Electives            2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               18
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 215  0101            University of Maryland                            Page 1392
Title      PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C         Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   LEISEY, KIM                 Fall   2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires:  30                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0    0    0    0    5    7   18   4.43   719/1674   3.64  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0    0    0    1    0   10   19   4.57   507/1674   3.86  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0    0    0    0    1   11   18   4.57   505/1423   3.86  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0    0    0    0    0   14   16   4.53   455/1609   3.96  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0    0    4    0    9    7   10   3.63  1142/1585   3.22  4.03  3.96  3.91  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0    1    1    2   14   12   4.17   767/1535   3.46  4.06  4.08  4.03  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0    0    0    2    6    6   16   4.20   934/1651   3.53  4.24  4.18  4.20  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0    0    0    0    0    0   30   5.00     1/1673   4.94  4.63  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5   0    0    0    0   18    7   4.28   680/1656   3.68  4.01  4.07  4.10  4.28

Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0    0    0    0    1    3   26   4.83   336/1586   4.42  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0    0    0    0    0    5   25   4.83   737/1585   4.70  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0    0    0    0    1    8   21   4.67   438/1582   4.25  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0    0    0    0    1    8   21   4.67   495/1575   3.95  4.29  4.27  4.39  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2    5    1    1    2    8   11   4.17   558/1380   3.41  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.17

Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  7    0    0    0    0    6   17   4.74   244/1520   4.07  4.03  4.01  4.03  4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  7    0    0    1    0    5   17   4.65   493/1515   4.62  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7    0    0    1    0    4   18   4.70   479/1511   4.34  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                    7    0    0    0    1    7   15   4.61   167/ 994   4.20  3.75  3.94  3.98  4.61
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PSYC 215  0201                    University of Maryland                                        Page 1393
Title          PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C                Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    LEISEY, KIM    (Instr. A)               Fall   2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires:  28                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   4   2   8   6   7  3.37 1553/1674   3.64  4.23  4.27  4.32  3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   3  10   8   6  3.63 1441/1674   3.86  4.18  4.23  4.26  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   2   8  11   5  3.63 1237/1423   3.86  4.23  4.27  4.36  3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0   0   3   6  11   6  3.77 1313/1609   3.96  4.23  4.22  4.23  3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0   5   3   7   5   5  3.08 1426/1585   3.22  4.03  3.96  3.91  3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  4   2   9   6   5  3.23 1394/1535   3.46  4.06  4.08  4.03  3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   5   8   9   3  3.31 1513/1651   3.53  4.24  4.18  4.20  3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   2  25  4.93  565/1673   4.94  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 2 0  3   3   3   1  3.20 1494/1656   3.68  4.01  4.07  4.10  3.49

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        17  0   0   0   3   5   3  4.00 1300/1586   4.42  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   17  0   0   0   1   2   8  4.64 1106/1585   4.70  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 18 0   0   0   3   6   1  3.80 1272/1582   4.25  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     16  0   0   2   3   5   2  3.58 1353/1575   3.95  4.29  4.27  4.39  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17 4 1  2   2   2   0  2.71 1298/1380   3.41  3.96  3.94  4.03  3.15

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9 0   2   0   4   6   7  3.84  961/1520   4.07  4.03  4.01  4.03  3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0   0   0   2   3  13  4.61  533/1515   4.62  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  1   0   3   4  10  4.22  927/1511   4.34  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  1   1   1   3   3   9  4.06  459/ 994   4.20  3.75  3.94  3.98  4.06


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27       0       0.00-0.99    0       A   18          Required for Majors   2     Graduate      0        Major       0
  28-55      11       1.00-1.99    0       B    5
  56-83       6       2.00-2.99    5       C    0          General               0     Under-grad   28        Non-major  28
  84-150      5       3.00-3.49    9       D    0
  Grad.       0       3.50-4.00    8       F    0          Electives             4     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                19
                                           ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 215  0201                University of Maryland                        Page 1394
Title       PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C              Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                    (Instr. B)             Fall   2005                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires:  28                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions                  NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   4   2   8   6   7  3.37 1553/1674  3.64  4.23  4.27 4.32  3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   3  10   8   6  3.63 1441/1674  3.86  4.18  4.23 4.26  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   1   2   8  11   5  3.63 1237/1423  3.86  4.23  4.27 4.36  3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0   0   3   6  11   6  3.77 1313/1609  3.96  4.23  4.22 4.23  3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0   5   3   7   5   5  3.08 1426/1585  3.22  4.03  3.96 3.91  3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   4   2   9   6   5  3.23 1394/1535  3.46  4.06  4.08 4.03  3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   5   8   9   3  3.31 1513/1651  3.53  4.24  4.18 4.20  3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   2  25  4.93  565/1673  4.94  4.63  4.69 4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0   6   3   8   3  3.40 1421/1656  3.68  4.01  4.07 4.10  3.49

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        7   0   0   1   2   5  13  4.43  974/1586  4.42  4.38  4.43 4.48  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7   0   0   0   3   0  18  4.71 1002/1585  4.70  4.60  4.69 4.76  4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0   0   0   5   6   7  4.11 1070/1582  4.25  4.26  4.26 4.35  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7   0   1   2   4   7   7  3.81 1264/1575  3.95  4.29  4.27 4.39  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 4   2   3   2   7   2  3.25 1160/1380  3.41  3.96  3.94 4.03  3.15

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   2   0   4   6   7  3.84  961/1520  4.07  4.03  4.01 4.03  3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0   0   0   2   3  13  4.61  533/1515  4.62  4.27  4.24 4.28  4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0  1   0   3   4  10  4.22  927/1511  4.34  4.27  4.27 4.28  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   1   1   1   3   3   9  4.06  459/ 994  4.20  3.75  3.94 3.98  4.06
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0      A    18       Required for Majors   2    Graduate      0      Major       0
 28-55     11        1.00-1.99   0      B     5
 56-83      6        2.00-2.99   5      C     0       General               0    Under-grad   28      Non-major  28
 84-150     5        3.00-3.49   9      D     0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   8      F     0       Electives             4    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P     0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I     0       Other                19
                                        ?     2
```

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 28   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5   Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  4  2  8  6  7  3.37 1553/1674  3.64  4.23  4.27  4.32  3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  3 10  8  6  3.63 1441/1674  3.86  4.18  4.23  4.26  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  1  2  8 11  5  3.63 1237/1423  3.86  4.23  4.27  4.36  3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  0  0  3  6 11  6  3.77 1313/1609  3.96  4.23  4.22  4.23  3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  5  3  7  5  5  3.08 1426/1585  3.22  4.03  3.96  3.91  3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 4 2  9  6  5  3.23 1394/1535  3.46  4.06  4.08  4.03  3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  0  1  5  8  9  3  3.31 1513/1651  3.53  4.24  4.18  4.20  3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  2 25  4.93  565/1673  4.94  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 0 0 4 8  2  3.86 1162/1656  3.68  4.01  4.07  4.10  3.49

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        12  0  0  1  1  4 10  4.44  960/1586  4.42  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   12  0  0  0  3  0 13  4.63 1118/1585  4.70  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0  0  0  2  4  8  4.43  748/1582  4.25  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     13  0  0  2  5  3  5  3.73 1299/1575  3.95  4.29  4.27  4.39  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 1 0 4  1  7  2  3.50 1036/1380  3.41  3.96  3.94  4.03  3.15

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  2  0  4  6  7  3.84  961/1520  4.07  4.03  4.01  4.03  3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61  533/1515  4.62  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1  0  3  4 10  4.22  927/1511  4.34  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  1  1  1  3  3  9  4.06  459/ 994  4.20  3.75  3.94  3.98  4.06
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0          A   18        Required for Majors   2      Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55     11        1.00-1.99   0          B    5
 56-83      6        2.00-2.99   5          C    0        General               0      Under-grad   28        Non-major   28
 84-150     5        3.00-3.49   9          D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   8          F    0        Electives             4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                19
                                            ?    2
```

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 20   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                       Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                        NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   2   2  15  4.68   380/1674   4.68  4.23  4.27 4.32  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68   352/1674   4.68  4.18  4.23 4.26  4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   1   5  13  4.63   417/1423   4.63  4.23  4.27 4.36  4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   0   3   5  11  4.42   614/1609   4.42  4.23  4.22 4.23  4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   2   5  11  4.50   326/1585   4.50  4.03  3.96 3.91  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1   0   0   4   4   9  4.29   619/1535   4.29  4.06  4.08 4.03  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83   157/1651   4.83  4.24  4.18 4.20  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0   0   0  17   1  4.06  1545/1673   4.06  4.63  4.69 4.67  4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0   0   0   1   6   7  4.43   493/1656   4.43  4.01  4.07 4.10  4.43

                     Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83   336/1586   4.83  4.38  4.43 4.48  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   3  15  4.83   737/1585   4.83  4.60  4.69 4.76  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   0   0   5  12  4.71   380/1582   4.71  4.26  4.26 4.35  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   0   1   3  14  4.72   407/1575   4.72  4.29  4.27 4.39  4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0   0   0   0   5  12  4.71   173/1380   4.71  3.96  3.94 4.03  4.71

                     Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   0   4   6  4.60   338/1520   4.60  4.03  4.01 4.03  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80   325/1515   4.80  4.27  4.24 4.28  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80   358/1511   4.80  4.27  4.27 4.28  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   10  0   0   0   3   3   4  4.10   445/ 994   4.10  3.75  3.94 3.98  4.10
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0        A   10      Required for Majors  11    Graduate     0       Major      7
28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    6
56-83      3      2.00-2.99   2        C    2      General               3    Under-grad  20       Non-major 13
84-150     2      3.00-3.49   7        D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   2        F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 5
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 285  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1397
Title      ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY               Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   JORDAN, LISA                      Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    75
Questionnaires: 27                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3   0  0  1  6  9  8  4.00 1196/1674  4.23  4.23  4.27 4.32  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0  1  2  5  9  7  3.79 1346/1674  3.96  4.18  4.23 4.26  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3   1  1  0  7  7  8  3.91 1097/1423  4.17  4.23  4.27 4.36  3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   1  2  0  6  5 10  3.91 1211/1609  3.94  4.23  4.22 4.23  3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  3  0  6  5 10  3.79 1014/1585  3.99  4.03  3.96 3.91  3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 2  5  9  6  3.74 1162/1535  3.65  4.06  4.08 4.03  3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  1  4  9  9  4.13  998/1651  3.87  4.24  4.18 4.20  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  0  1 22  4.96  353/1673  4.61  4.63  4.69 4.67  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 2 12  8  0  3.17 1503/1656  3.77  4.01  4.07 4.10  3.17


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  1  2  7 14  4.42  989/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43 4.48  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  2  1  9 12  4.29 1378/1585  4.71  4.60  4.69 4.76  4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  2  8  9  5  3.71 1333/1582  4.22  4.26  4.26 4.35  3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  1  2  5 12  4  3.67 1329/1575  4.26  4.29  4.27 4.39  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1  0  1  9  5  8  3.87  824/1380  4.04  3.96  3.94 4.03  3.87


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  0  5  5  4  1  3.07 1341/1520  3.51  4.03  4.01 4.03  3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  2  2  4  4  3  3.27 1379/1515  3.80  4.27  4.24 4.28  3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  1  2  4  8  4.27  886/1511  4.06  4.27  4.27 4.28  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   1  4  2  4  4  0  2.57  959/ 994  3.20  3.75  3.94 3.98  2.57


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23 4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0 1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19 4.36  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33 4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20 4.48  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41 4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48 4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39 4.22  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 26   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 4.82  ****


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 4.50  ****

                                         Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    4        0.00-0.99   0        A    4       Required for Majors  8      Graduate      0         Major       6
  28-55    6        1.00-1.99   0        B   13
  56-83    3        2.00-2.99   2        C    5       General              4      Under-grad   27         Non-major  21
  84-150   3        3.00-3.49   3        D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   3        F    0       Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                9
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 285  0201           University of Maryland                          Page 1398
Title      ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY             Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    ANDERSON, ROBER             Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     64
Questionnaires: 60                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   3  13  43  4.62  471/1674  4.23  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   1   1   7  17  33  4.36  803/1674  3.96  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   8  13  39  4.52  563/1423  4.17  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  14   0   1   7  14  23  4.31  771/1609  3.94  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1   0   0   1   3  17  38  4.56  295/1585  3.99  4.03  3.96  3.91  4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  18   3   3   5  10  20  4.00  870/1535  3.65  4.06  4.08  4.03  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   2  11   3  13   6  24  3.51 1442/1651  3.87  4.24  4.18  4.20  3.51
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0  49  10  4.17 1484/1673  4.61  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0   0   0   3  24  32  4.49  395/1656  3.77  4.01  4.07  4.10  4.49

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   2   8  19  30  4.31 1104/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   4  55  4.93  397/1585  4.71  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2   0   0   0   6  12  40  4.59  546/1582  4.22  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   2   2   0  12  42  4.55  635/1575  4.26  4.29  4.27  4.39  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2   3   1   3   7  17  27  4.20  540/1380  4.04  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.20

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  17   0   2   1   4  12  24  4.28  626/1520  3.51  4.03  4.01  4.03  4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  17   0   0   1   1  10  31  4.65  493/1515  3.80  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  17   0   0   0   1   7  35  4.79  369/1511  4.06  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.79
4. Were special techniques successful                  17  15   2   1   6  10   9  3.82  604/ 994  3.20  3.75  3.94  3.98  3.82

          Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  59   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.36  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  59   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  59   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.45  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    59   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                59   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  4.63  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  59   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  59   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       58   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   58   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  58   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  58   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    58   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      58   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       58   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     58   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 285  0201          University of Maryland              Page 1398
Title       ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY           Baltimore County                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   ANDERSON, ROBER              Fall   2005                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     64
Questionnaires:  60               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    3       0.00-0.99    0      A   19      Required for Majors  13    Graduate    0      Major       18
28-55    9       1.00-1.99    0      B   22
56-83    6       2.00-2.99   11      C    8      General               8    Under-grad  60     Non-major   42
84-150   7       3.00-3.49   10      D    0
Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    8      F    0      Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other                30
                                     ?    6
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 285  0301              University of Maryland                                    Page 1399
Title       ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY             Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  JORDAN, EDWARD                    Fall   2005                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    76
Questionnaires: 44                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                         NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean  Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   2   1  12  18  11  3.80 1389/1674  4.23  4.23  4.27 4.32  3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   2   4  19  15   4  3.34 1556/1674  3.96  4.18  4.23 4.26  3.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   2   7  13  12  10  3.48 1277/1423  4.17  4.23  4.27 4.36  3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  26   3   1   5   4   5  3.39 1488/1609  3.94  4.23  4.22 4.23  3.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   5   3   6   9  13   8  3.44 1274/1585  3.99  4.03  3.96 3.91  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  28   3   2   6   4   1  2.88 1475/1535  3.65  4.06  4.08 4.03  2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          0   0   3  12   9  12   8  3.23 1532/1651  3.87  4.24  4.18 4.20  3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                0   1   0   0   0  29  14  4.33 1368/1673  4.61  4.63  4.69 4.67  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  5   1   3   3  18  11   3  3.21 1490/1656  3.77  4.01  4.07 4.10  3.21


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   2   1   6  12  22  4.19 1198/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43 4.48  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   4   9  30  4.60 1142/1585  4.71  4.60  4.69 4.76  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0   1   4   4  19  15  4.00 1129/1582  4.22  4.26  4.26 4.35  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1   3   4   7   8  20  3.90 1216/1575  4.26  4.29  4.27 4.39  3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2   4   2   2  14  10  10  3.63  980/1380  4.04  3.96  3.94 4.03  3.63


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21   0   5   5   5   7   1  2.74 1438/1520  3.51  4.03  4.01 4.03  2.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22   0   3   3   6   5   5  3.27 1376/1515  3.80  4.27  4.24 4.28  3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22   0   2   6   4   6   4  3.18 1387/1511  4.06  4.27  4.27 4.28  3.18
4. Were special techniques successful                22  18   3   0   0   1   0  1.75 ****/ 994  3.20  3.75  3.94 3.98  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 43   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41 4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 43   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48 4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              43   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14 4.63  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons               Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      5        0.00-0.99    0       A   24        Required for Majors  9      Graduate      1        Major        9
  28-55     10        1.00-1.99    1       B   15
  56-83     10        2.00-2.99    5       C    3        General              5      Under-grad   43        Non-major   35
  84-150     3        3.00-3.49   13       D    0
  Grad.      1        3.50-4.00    8       F    0        Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other               28
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 285  0401            University of Maryland                              Page 1400
Title      ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY             Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RESTA, PETER                 Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      75
Questionnaires: 38                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  3   0  0  0  5  7  23  4.51  594/1674  4.23  4.23  4.27  4.32  4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   3   0  1  1  4  8  21  4.34  816/1674  3.96  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  3   1  0  1  1  3  29  4.76  250/1423  4.17  4.23  4.27  4.36  4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   3   7  2  0  4  8  14  4.14  985/1609  3.94  4.23  4.22  4.23  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 1  1  0  8  7  17  4.18  622/1585  3.99  4.03  3.96  3.91  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 3 2 2 5 8 14  3.97  930/1535  3.65  4.06  4.08  4.03  3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           5   0  0  0  4  5  24  4.61  393/1651  3.87  4.24  4.18  4.20  4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                 4   0  0  0  0  0  34  5.00    1/1673  4.61  4.63  4.69  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0 2 3 10 13  4.21  770/1656  3.77  4.01  4.07  4.10  4.21


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       6   0  1  1  1  3  26  4.63  723/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  5   0  0  0  0  0  33  5.00    1/1585  4.71  4.60  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0  1  0  2  6  24  4.58  557/1582  4.22  4.26  4.26  4.35  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    5   0  0  0  1  1  31  4.91  171/1575  4.26  4.29  4.27  4.39  4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 1 0 3 8 21  4.45  341/1380  4.04  3.96  3.94  4.03  4.45


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 3 1 3 3 13  3.96  867/1520  3.51  4.03  4.01  4.03  3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 1 2 5 3 12  4.00 1024/1515  3.80  4.27  4.24  4.28  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 1 3 2 6 11 4.00 1050/1511  4.06  4.27  4.27  4.28  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 15  18  0  0  0  0  5  5.00 ****/ 994  3.20  3.75  3.94  3.98  ****


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32  3  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  4.34  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 33 0 1 0 1 1 2  3.60 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 3 0 0 0 1 2  4.67 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          33  1  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33  4.42  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 32 3 0 0 1 0 2  4.33 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.48  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 32 1 1 0 1 0 3  3.80 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 0 1 0 0 3 2  3.83 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 1 0 2 2  4.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   32  3  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               32  2  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  4.63  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 34 0 1 0 0 1 2  3.75 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 34 0 1 0 0 1 2  3.75 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      33  0  0  0  3  0  2  3.80 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  34  1  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 34 1 0 0 0 1 2  4.67 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 34 0 0 1 1 0 2  3.75 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   35  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     34  1  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      34  1  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    34  1  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 285  0401                University of Maryland                    Page 1400
Title       ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY                  Baltimore County                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RESTA, PETER                         Fall   2005                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    75
Questionnaires: 38                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4        0.00-0.99    2        A   20        Required for Majors  9     Graduate    0         Major        3
 28-55     7        1.00-1.99    0        B    6                                                         
 56-83     5        2.00-2.99    5        C    1        General              7     Under-grad  38        Non-major   35
 84-150    3        3.00-3.49    7        D    0                                                         
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    4        F    0        Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other               14
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 304  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1401
Title      ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   FREIBERG, KAREN             Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      82
Questionnaires: 46                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    4   0  1  1  5 10 25  4.36  829/1674  4.36  4.23  4.27 4.26  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     5   0  0  2  5 15 19  4.24  943/1674  4.24  4.18  4.23 4.21  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4   0  1  4  6 12 19  4.05  992/1423  4.05  4.23  4.27 4.27  4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     4  31  1  1  2  2  5  3.82 ****/1609  ****  4.23  4.22 4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5   2  0  1  6 14 18  4.26  557/1585  4.26  4.03  3.96 3.95  4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 33 0 0 3  2  4  4.11 ****/1535  ****  4.06  4.08 4.15  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0  0  0  2  8 32  4.71  276/1651  4.71  4.24  4.18 4.16  4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0  0  0  3 30  9  4.14 1497/1673  4.14  4.63  4.69 4.68  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0 0  0  8 11 12  4.13  871/1656  4.13  4.01  4.07 4.07  4.13


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0  0  0  1 14 25  4.60  753/1586  4.60  4.38  4.43 4.42  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  2  5 33  4.78  874/1585  4.78  4.60  4.69 4.66  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7   0  0  1  6  9 23  4.38  798/1582  4.38  4.26  4.26 4.26  4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   0  0  1  5  8 25  4.46  742/1575  4.46  4.29  4.27 4.25  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7  0  0  0  3  8 28  4.64  213/1380  4.64  3.96  3.94 4.01  4.64


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23  0  1  1  3  8 10  4.09  783/1520  4.09  4.03  4.01 4.09  4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23  0  0  1  4  5 13  4.30  857/1515  4.30  4.27  4.24 4.32  4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 2  1  1  4 15  4.26  886/1511  4.26  4.27  4.27 4.34  4.26
4. Were special techniques successful                   23 15  4  0  1  0  3  2.75 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94 3.96  ****


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19 4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 45 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46 4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33 4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20 4.18  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 44  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41 4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31 3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39 4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14 3.48  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98 4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93 3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 3.27  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09 3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26 3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44 3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      45  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 304  0101            University of Maryland                    Page 1401
Title       ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY           Baltimore County                      JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  FREIBERG, KAREN                 Fall   2005                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    82
Questionnaires: 46                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1       0.00-0.99    0        A   13       Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0      Major        20
 28-55    3       1.00-1.99    0        B   21
 56-83    3       2.00-2.99    6        C    2       General          14        Under-grad  46      Non-major    26
 84-150  17       3.00-3.49    7        D    0
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    7        F    1       Electives         2        #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other            20
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 308  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1402
Title      CHILD MALTREATMENT             Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    O'BRIEN, EILEEN               Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      50
Questionnaires:  29                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  0  3  5 20  4.61  485/1674   4.61  4.23  4.27 4.26  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  2 10 16  4.50  578/1674   4.50  4.18  4.23 4.21  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  1  2  2 12 11  4.07  974/1423   4.07  4.23  4.27 4.27  4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1  0  1  1 11 14  4.41  645/1609   4.41  4.23  4.22 4.27  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  2  6 20  4.64  238/1585   4.64  4.03  3.96 3.95  4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4  0  1  2  8 13  4.38  538/1535   4.38  4.06  4.08 4.15  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  1  6  6 15  4.25  866/1651   4.25  4.24  4.18 4.16  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1  0  0  0  2 25  4.93  565/1673   4.93  4.63  4.69 4.68  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  1  0  4 12  9  4.08  912/1656   4.08  4.01  4.07 4.07  4.08


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  4 24  4.86  301/1586   4.86  4.38  4.43 4.42  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  2 26  4.93  453/1585   4.93  4.60  4.69 4.66  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  3 24  4.82  227/1582   4.82  4.26  4.26 4.26  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  5 22  4.75  359/1575   4.75  4.29  4.27 4.25  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  2  0  3 23  4.68  193/1380   4.68  3.96  3.94 4.01  4.68


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  1  5 12  4.61  330/1520   4.61  4.03  4.01 4.09  4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  289/1515   4.83  4.27  4.24 4.32  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  447/1511   4.72  4.27  4.27 4.34  4.72
4. Were special techniques successful                   12  2  2  0  2  5  6  3.87  586/ 994   3.87  3.75  3.94 3.96  3.87


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   28  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265   ****  4.18  4.23 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 278   ****  4.43  4.19 4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260   ****  4.45  4.46 4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            28  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259   ****  4.60  4.33 4.33  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors

00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0      A    8       Required for Majors   7    Graduate     0     Major         8
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B   14
56-83      1       2.00-2.99   3      C    2       General              9    Under-grad  29     Non-major    21
84-150    11       3.00-3.49   6      D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   1      F    0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                     I    0        Other               10
                                     ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 317  8020              University of Maryland                        Page 1403
Title      COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY             Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   Alonso, Diane                 Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      35
Questionnaires:  29                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  2  3 12 12  4.17 1046/1674  4.17  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  9 17  4.45  673/1674  4.45  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  3 11 14  4.39  707/1423  4.39  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  2  1  2  7 15  4.19  941/1609  4.19  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  3  7 17  4.31  502/1585  4.31  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 0 4 7 14  4.04  857/1535  4.04  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  2 26  4.86  139/1651  4.86  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 29  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 2 15 7  4.21  783/1656  4.21  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.21


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  1  0  7 21  4.66  678/1586  4.66  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  5 22  4.75  917/1585  4.75  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  2  1  8 18  4.45  719/1582  4.45  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  1  1  0  2  7 17  4.44  768/1575  4.44  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1 0 3 24  4.79  125/1380  4.79  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.79


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  3 10 14  4.24  654/1520  4.24  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  2  6 21  4.66  493/1515  4.66  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.66
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 2 4 23  4.72  447/1511  4.72  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.72
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  5  1  0  4 10  9  4.08  450/ 994  4.08  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.08


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  26  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           28  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                28  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    27  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      28  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       28  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     28  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****

                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned      Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0      A   13      Required for Majors  3    Graduate     0      Major       20
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   1      B   12
  56-83     4      2.00-2.99   0      C    2      General              4    Under-grad  29      Non-major    9
  84-150    5      3.00-3.49   5      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   6      F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                    responses to be significant
I    0              Other            17
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 320  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1404
Title       PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME        Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: MARTINKOWSKI, K              Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires: 28                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0  0  0  4  6 16  4.46  671/1674  4.46  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  0  3 23  4.88  153/1674  4.88  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  0  0  2 24  4.92  105/1423  4.92  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2  14  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  157/1609  4.83  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  1  2  3 20  4.62  258/1585  4.62  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 13 0  1  0  1 11  4.69  215/1535  4.69  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  0  1  4 21  4.77  220/1651  4.77  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  7 19  4.73  987/1673  4.73  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0  0  0 11 10  4.48  423/1656  4.48  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.48

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  1 25  4.96   86/1586  4.96  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  3 23  4.88  615/1585  4.88  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  2 24  4.92  121/1582  4.92  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  1  5 20  4.73  391/1575  4.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 15 4  1  0  0  4  2.89 1272/1380  2.89  3.96  3.94  4.01  2.89

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  1  2  1 12  4.50  397/1520  4.50  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  1  0  0  3 12  4.56  577/1515  4.56  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  1  1  0 14  4.69  488/1511  4.69  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                   12 11  1  0  0  0  4  4.20 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   25  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  3.27  ****

          Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      27  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
  00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   15   Required for Majors   1   Graduate   0   Major   22
  28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   7
  56-83   3   2.00-2.99   3   C   2   General   2   Under-grad   28   Non-major   6
  84-150   9   3.00-3.49   8   D   0
  Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   4   F   0   Electives   2   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   18
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: PSYC 330  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1405
Title         CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR        Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   CHEAH, CHARISSA               Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      37
Questionnaires:  31              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level   Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3   0   1   0   3   7  17  4.39   780/1674   4.39  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3   0   0   0   4   6  18  4.50   578/1674   4.50  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   0   1   3  11  14  4.31   792/1423   4.31  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3   2   0   0   2  10  14  4.46   552/1609   4.46  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1   0   1   5  12  10  4.11   702/1585   4.11  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  3   1   2  10  13  4.00   870/1535   4.00  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   0   1   3   8  17  4.41   658/1651   4.41  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   1   0   0   1  24   2  4.04  1553/1673   4.04  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   1   4  14   7  4.04   936/1656   4.04  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.04


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   0   0   0   7  19  4.73   538/1586   4.73  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   1   3  22  4.81   811/1585   4.81  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   1   2  10  14  4.37   808/1582   4.37  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   1   1   1   5  19  4.48   717/1575   4.48  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0  0   0   4   4  19  4.56   272/1380   4.56  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.56


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   2   0   2   8  11  4.13   751/1520   4.13  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   0   0   3   2  19  4.67   483/1515   4.67  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   1   4  19  4.75   414/1511   4.75  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  7   4   1   1   6   5   7  3.80   614/ 994   3.80  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.80


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   12          Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0       Major       21
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   12                                      
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99    5      C    3          General               7     Under-grad   31       Non-major   10
  84-150     9      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3      F    0          Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                       I    0          Other                17
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1406
Title           EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I        Baltimore County                                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     GRONINGER, LOWE (Instr. A)  Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 23                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                 Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    9   0  1  0  4  3  6  3.93 1296/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     9   0  1  2  3  4  4  3.57 1465/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    9   0  1  1  4  3  5  3.71 1188/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     9   5  1  2  3  1  2  3.11 1548/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9   0  1  0  2  4  7  4.14  662/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 5  2  0  2  3  2  3.33 1355/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             9   1  3  0  2  5  3  3.38 1490/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                   9   1  0  0  0  7  6  4.46 1246/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 1  2  5  5  0  3.08 1530/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.69


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         9   0  1  0  2  6  5  4.00 1300/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    9   0  0  0  2  4  8  4.43 1292/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9   0  0  2  5  5  2  3.50 1406/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      9   0  0  2  5  2  5  3.71 1309/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9  1  0  2  4  4  3  3.62  992/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.97


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  1  1  1  1  6  4.00  810/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  1  0  3  1  5  3.90 1137/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  2  3  1  4  3.70 1249/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.70
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  7  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   12  1  1  0  0  1  8  4.50   93/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0  0  1  3  6  4.50   86/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 4  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            13  1  0  0  0  3  6  4.67   89/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13  6  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     21  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 21  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  21  0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  21  0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        21  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    21  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     21  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       21  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        21  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1407
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  GRONINGER, LOWE (Instr. B)     Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     23
Questionnaires: 23                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   9   0   1   0   4   3   6  3.93 1296/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0   1   2   3   4   4  3.57 1465/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   9   0   1   1   4   3   5  3.71 1188/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    9   5   1   2   3   1   2  3.11 1548/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0   1   0   2   4   7  4.14  662/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 5  2   0   2   3   2  3.33 1355/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            9   1   3   0   2   5   3  3.38 1490/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  9   1   0   0   0   7   6  4.46 1246/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0 0   0   2   4   2  4.00  955/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.69

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        18  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80 ****/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   18  0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60 ****/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17 0  0   0   1   3   2  4.17 1025/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     18  0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20 ****/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 19 0 0   1   1   0   2  3.75 ****/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.97

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  1   1   1   1   6  4.00  810/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  1   0   3   1   5  3.90 1137/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0   2   3   1   4  3.70 1249/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.70
4. Were special techniques successful                  13  7   1   0   1   0   1  3.00 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  1   1   0   0   1   8  4.50   93/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0  0   1   3   6  4.50   86/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 4 0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13  1   0   0   0   3   6  4.67   89/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  6   0   0   0   0   4  5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 1  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21  0   2   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21  0   2   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21  1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      21  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       21  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
```

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   9   0  1  0  4  3  6  3.93 1296/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    9   0  1  2  3  4  4  3.57 1465/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   9   0  1  1  4  3  5  3.71 1188/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    9   5  1  2  3  1  2  3.11 1548/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9  0  1  0  2  4  7  4.14  662/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 5 2 0 2 3  2  3.33 1355/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            9   1  3  0  2  5  3  3.38 1490/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  9   1  0  0  0  7  6  4.46 1246/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1 0 0 3 3  3  4.00  955/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.69

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       13   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  858/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  13   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60 1142/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12 0 0 0 2 5 4  4.18 1007/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12   0  0  1  0  3  7  4.45  755/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 2 0 1 0 1 4  4.33  426/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.97

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 1 1 1 6  4.00  810/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 1 0 3 1 5  3.90 1137/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 2 3 1 4  3.70 1249/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.70
4. Were special techniques successful                 13   7  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12   1  1  0  0  1  8  4.50   93/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0 0 1 3 6  4.50   86/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 4 0 0 0 0 6  5.00    1/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          13   1  0  0  0  3  6  4.67   89/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  6  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 1 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   21   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               21   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 2 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 2 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      21   1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  21   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 1 1 0  3.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   21   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     21   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      21   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0101            University of Maryland                    Page 1408
Title          EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I       Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                    (Instr. C)      Fall  2005                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 23                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0102            University of Maryland                                      Page 1409
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I          Baltimore County                                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   GRONINGER, LOWE (Instr. A)       Fall   2005                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 19                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
       Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   10   0  1  0  2  3  3  3.78 1398/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    10   0  2  1  3  1  2  3.00 1608/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   10   0  1  3  1  1  3  3.22 1338/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    10   5  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 ****/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  2  1  2  3  3.44 1267/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 3  1  1  1  3  0  3.00 1435/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            10   0  1  2  2  4  0  3.00 1562/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  10   0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44 1267/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0 3  0  2  2  0  2.43 1625/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.11


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        10   0  1  1  4  1  2  3.22 1525/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   10   0  2  1  1  1  4  3.44 1556/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  3.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10  0  4  0  1  3  1  2.67 1557/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     10   0  2  1  1  4  1  3.11 1472/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0  3  1  0  3  2  3.00 1217/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  1  3  3  3.88  942/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86 1158/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 1  1  2  2  1  3.14 1396/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   5  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13   0  1  0  0  2  3  4.00  178/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0 0  0  0  2  4  4.67   57/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 2 0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13   1  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   45/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13  3  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   2   Required for Majors 0   Graduate   0   Major   8
 28-55   2   1.00-1.99   0   B   4
 56-83   3   2.00-2.99   2   C   2   General   0   Under-grad 19   Non-major   11
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   0   D   1
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   9
                                           ?   0

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0102                  University of Maryland                                    Page 1410
Title          EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I             Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                    (Instr. B)       Fall   2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 19                              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank   Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   10   0  1  0  2  3  3  3.78 1398/1674  4.34   4.23  4.27 4.26  3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    10   0  2  1  3  1  2  3.00 1608/1674  4.25   4.18  4.23 4.21  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   10   0  1  3  1  1  3  3.22 1338/1423  4.36   4.23  4.27 4.27  3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    10   5  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 ****/1609  4.27   4.23  4.22 4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0  1  2  1  2  3  3.44 1267/1585  3.89   4.03  3.96 3.95  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10 3  1  1  1  1  3  3.00 1435/1535  4.02   4.06  4.08 4.15  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            10   0  1  2  2  4  0  3.00 1562/1651  4.20   4.24  4.18 4.16  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  10   0  0  0  0  5  4  4.44 1267/1673  4.81   4.63  4.69 4.68  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 1  0  0  2  2  3.80 1200/1656  3.99   4.01  4.07 4.07  3.11

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        14   0  1  0  2  0  2  3.40 1499/1586  4.38   4.38  4.43 4.42  3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   13   0  1  1  0  0  4  3.83 1518/1585  4.29   4.60  4.69 4.66  3.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13  0  2  0  0  2  2  3.33 1457/1582  4.23   4.26  4.26 4.26  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     14   0  1  1  0  0  3  3.60 1350/1575  4.34   4.29  4.27 4.25  3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 2  1  0  0  2  1  3.50 ****/1380  3.95   3.96  3.94 4.01  3.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  1  3  3  3.88  942/1520  4.30   4.03  4.01 4.09  3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12  0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86 1158/1515  4.25   4.27  4.24 4.32  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0  1  1  2  2  1  3.14 1396/1511  4.18   4.27  4.27 4.34  3.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   5  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 994  3.87   3.75  3.94 3.96  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  13   0  1  0  0  2  3  4.00  178/ 265  4.23   4.18  4.23 4.26  4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   57/ 278  4.36   4.43  4.19 4.24  4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 2  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/ 260  4.37   4.45  4.46 4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           13   1  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   45/ 259  4.53   4.60  4.33 4.33  4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13   3  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 233  3.00   3.00  4.20 4.18  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****   4.50  4.41 4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****   4.58  4.48 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  95  ****   4.15  4.31 3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****   4.41  4.39 4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****   4.02  4.14 3.48  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  76  ****   ****  3.98 4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****   ****  3.93 3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****   ****  4.45 3.87  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  61  ****   ****  4.09 3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****   ****  4.26 3.50  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****   ****  4.36 3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****   ****  4.34 4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0102                    University of Maryland                        Page 1410
Title          EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I                Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                        (Instr. B)          Fall   2005                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires:  19                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0         A    2        Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0        Major        8
 28-55      2        1.00-1.99    0         B    4                                                           
 56-83      3        2.00-2.99    2         C    2        General              0      Under-grad   19        Non-major   11
 84-150     1        3.00-3.49    0         D    1
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3         F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                9
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0103           University of Maryland                              Page 1411
Title          EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I      Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    GRONINGER, LOWE (Instr. A)     Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 21                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    12   0   1   0   1   4   3  3.89 1334/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     13   0   1   1   3   2   1  3.13 1596/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    13   0   0   1   0   4   3  4.13  943/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     13   3   0   0   1   4   0  3.80 ****/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 13   1   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  395/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 13 2   2   0   0   4   0  3.00 1435/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             13   0   0   1   4   1   2  3.50 1442/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   13   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  760/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 0   1   1   1   2   0  2.80 ****/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  ****

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         13   0   0   1   1   2   4  4.13 1237/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    13   0   2   0   3   1   2  3.13 1572/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13   0   0   0   3   4   1  3.75 1302/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      13   0   0   1   2   2   3  3.88 1230/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13  0   0   1   2   1   4  4.00  666/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  295/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  733/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15  0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  507/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   15   2   0   0   1   1   2  4.25 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   15   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50   86/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15  2   0   0   0   1   3  4.75 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            15   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15   4   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     19   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 19   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  19   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        19   1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    19   0   1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  19   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  3.27  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     19   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       19   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        19   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      19   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0103            University of Maryland                              Page 1412
Title          EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I        Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)    Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      21
Questionnaires:  21                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   12   0  1  0  1  4  3 3.89 1334/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27 4.26  3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    13   0  1  1  3  2  1 3.13 1596/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23 4.21  3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   13   0  0  1  0  4  3 4.13  943/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27 4.27  4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    13   3  0  0  1  4  0 3.80 ****/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22 4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 13  1  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  395/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96 3.95  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 13 2 2  0  0  4  0 3.00 1435/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08 4.15  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            13   0  0  1  4  1  2 3.50 1442/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18 4.16  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  13   0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  760/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69 4.68  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 18 0 0 0  0  2  1 4.33 ****/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07 4.07  ****

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        16   0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80 ****/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43 4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   15   0  1  0  1  2  2 3.67 1539/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69 4.66  3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80 ****/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26 4.26  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     16   0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80 ****/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27 4.25  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 1 0  0  0  3  1 4.25 ****/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94 4.01  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  0  0  0  2  4 4.67  295/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01 4.09  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  733/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24 4.32  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  0  0  2  4 4.67  507/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27 4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   2  0  0  1  1  2 4.25 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94 3.96  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  15   0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23 4.26  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 1  1  4 4.50   86/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19 4.24  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 2 0  0  0  1  3 4.75 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46 4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           15   0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33 4.33  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  15  4  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20 4.18  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41 4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0 0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19  1  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31 3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19   0  0  1  0  0  1 3.50 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39 4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19   0  1  0  0  0  1 3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14 3.48  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19   0  0  1  0  0  1 3.50 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98 4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  19  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93 3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   1  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19   0  1  0  1  0  0 2.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  19  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 3.27  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09 3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19   0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26 3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      19   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44 3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       19   0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     19   0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0103          University of Maryland              Page 1412
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I            Baltimore County                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:              (Instr. B)           Fall   2005                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires: 21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0202                 University of Maryland                              Page 1413
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I                    Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  WARWICK, ZOE                            Fall  2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 12                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                    Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                        NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0   1   0   2   1   7  4.18 1036/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.18
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   0   2   4   5  4.27  906/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.27
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   0   1   2   3   5  4.09  962/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.09
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   3   3   4  4.10 1029/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.10
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   3   4   4  4.09  708/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.09
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  0   0   3   4   3  4.00  870/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   0   0   3   1   7  4.36  727/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.36
 8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0   0   0   0   6   5  4.45 1257/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.45
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   3   8   0  3.73 1260/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.73

           Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  786/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.82
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0   0   2   2   7  4.45  704/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.45
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   1   0   0   2   1   7  4.50  692/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.50
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1  0   0   0   3   6  4.67  200/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.67

           Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0  0   1   2   0   3  3.83  967/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.83
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  0   0   2   1   2  4.00 1024/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0   1   1   1   2  3.80 1194/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.80
 4. Were special techniques successful                 7   2   0   1   0   2   0  3.33  811/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.33

           Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5   0   0   2   0   0   5  4.14  164/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.14
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0  0   0   2   0   5  4.43  110/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.43
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 1  1   0   1   1   3  3.83  237/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  3.83
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          6   0   0   1   1   0   4  4.17  176/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  4.17
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8  2   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

                                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0203               University of Maryland                            Page 1414
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I            Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  WARWICK, ZOE                    Fall   2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires:  22                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
        Questions                      NR  NA   1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
        General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  1  4  3 14  4.36   817/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  1  3  8 10  4.23   968/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1  0  3  6 12  4.27   828/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5   0  3  1  6  7  4.00  1094/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1  1  5  6  9  3.95   838/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  3  2  2  9  4.06   844/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  1  3  4 14  4.41   673/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1   0  0  0 10 10  4.50  1203/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0  0  5  9  3  3.88  1139/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.88


        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  4  5 13  4.41  1004/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  1  2  3 16  4.55  1191/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  1  4  7 10  4.18  1007/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   2   0  1  4  5 10  4.20  1010/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  4  1  1  3  3 10  4.11   612/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.11


        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0   1  1  3  1  9  4.07   790/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0   1  1  4  2  7  3.87  1154/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  1  0  6  1  7  3.87  1161/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.87
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   5   1  2  3  2  2  3.20   847/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.20


        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   0   0  0  1  1  6  4.63    69/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0  0  1  1  6  4.63    67/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38   166/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0   0  0  2  1  5  4.38   135/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14   3   0  0  1  0  4  4.60  ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****


        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****


        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  3.27  ****


        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     21   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0203              University of Maryland                    Page 1414
Title          EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I          Baltimore County                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    WARWICK, ZOE                  Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 22                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type              Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2         0.00-0.99   1     A   11        Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0     Major       18
28-55     3         1.00-1.99   0     B    9
56-83     7         2.00-2.99   5     C    1        General              0    Under-grad  22    Non-major    4
84-150    3         3.00-3.49   4     D    0
Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   4     F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other               19
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0301            University of Maryland                                      Page 1415
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I            Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)        Fall   2005                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

			Freq	uenc	ies			Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	558/1674	4.34	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	303/1674	4.25	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	195/1423	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	408/1609	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	926/1585	3.89	4.03	3.96	3.95	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	667/1535	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1651	4.20	4.24	4.18	4.16	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	230/1656	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.20

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.38	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	567/1585	4.29	4.60	4.69	4.66	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	236/1582	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	268/1575	4.34	4.29	4.27	4.25	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	463/1380	3.95	3.96	3.94	4.01	3.57

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	512/1520	4.30	4.03	4.01	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	759/1515	4.25	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	751/1511	4.18	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.87	3.75	3.94	3.96	3.50

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 265	4.23	4.18	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	4.36	4.43	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	4.53	4.60	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	3.00	3.00	4.20	4.18	****

Seminar

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.58	4.48	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.41	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.02	4.14	3.48	****

Field Work

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****

Self Paced

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0301              University of Maryland                                    Page 1416
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I             Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B)          Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 11                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	558/1674	4.34	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	303/1674	4.25	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	195/1423	4.36	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	408/1609	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	926/1585	3.89	4.03	3.96	3.95	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	667/1535	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1651	4.20	4.24	4.18	4.16	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.81	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	955/1656	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	1472/1585	4.29	4.60	4.69	4.66	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	935/1582	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1060/1575	4.34	4.29	4.27	4.25	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.95	3.96	3.94	4.01	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	512/1520	4.30	4.03	4.01	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	759/1515	4.25	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	751/1511	4.18	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	732/ 994	3.87	3.75	3.94	3.96	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 265	4.23	4.18	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	4.36	4.43	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	4.53	4.60	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	3.00	3.00	4.20	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.58	4.48	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.41	4.39	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.02	4.14	3.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0301            University of Maryland                        Page 1416
Title           EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I       Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:     PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B)   Fall   2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0301              University of Maryland                              Page 1417
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I           Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                (Instr. C)       Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires:  11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  558/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  303/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  195/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  408/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1  0  0  4  2  3  3.89  926/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  667/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  116/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  0  1  5  2  3.78 1222/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.20


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0  1  1  1  0  5  3.88 1379/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0  1  0  3  0  4  3.75 1529/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  1  1  1  5  4.25  935/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4   0  0  0  3  0  4  4.14 1060/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  1  2  0  1  0  3  3.33 1127/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.57


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  512/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  759/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  751/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   1  0  2  0  0  2  3.50  732/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.50


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   9   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            9   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    10  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  3.27  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       10  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      10  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0301            University of Maryland                      Page 1417
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I          Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                  (Instr. C)        Fall   2005                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0301              University of Maryland                              Page 1418
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I            Baltimore County                                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                 (Instr. D)            Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      28
Questionnaires: 11                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   1   8  4.55  558/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   9  4.73  303/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  195/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3   0   0   1   1   5  4.57  408/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   0   0   4   2   3  3.89  926/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0   0   2   2   4  4.25  667/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  116/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   1   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   0   6   3  4.33  615/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.20


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   2   0   6  4.50  858/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   3   0   5  4.25 1397/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   2   1   5  4.38  808/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   0   2   1   4  4.29  932/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1  2   0   1   0   3  3.33 1127/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.57


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40  512/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   0   3   2  4.40  759/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0   0   0   3   2  4.40  751/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   1   0   2   0   0   2  3.50  732/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.50


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0  0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   10  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  3.27  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     10  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0301                    University of Maryland                              Page 1418
Title          EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I                 Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                       (Instr. D)           Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 11                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0302              University of Maryland                              Page 1419
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)      Fall  2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 20                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   3  15  4.65  419/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  176/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   4  16  4.80  203/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2   0   0   4   0  14  4.56  432/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3   2   0   3   5   6  3.81  996/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0   0   1   2  11  4.71  200/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   3   2  14  4.45  613/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95  424/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   0   4  13  4.76  178/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.07

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   3  17  4.85  301/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90  567/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   3  16  4.75  313/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95  103/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5  0   1   5   4   5  3.87  824/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.52

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0   1   1   3  11  4.50  397/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   0   0   2   3  10  4.53  603/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  1   0   3   1   9  4.21  937/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6   0   0   0   5   5  4.50  205/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.50

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  19   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****

            Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0      A   9    Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major        14
28-55     7      1.00-1.99   2      B   6                              Under-grad   20     Non-major     6
56-83     8      2.00-2.99   8      C   3    General              1
84-150    2      3.00-3.49   3      D   0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   2      F   0    Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P   0                              responses to be significant
                                    I   0    Other               16
                                    ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0302                University of Maryland                        Page 1420
Title         EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I            Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                   (Instr. B)         Fall   2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      36
Questionnaires:  20                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  3  15  4.65  419/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  17  4.85  176/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  4  16  4.80  203/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  4  0  14  4.56  432/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  2  0  3  5   6  3.81  996/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  1  2  11  4.71  200/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  3  2  14  4.45  613/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  19  4.95  424/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 3 1  0  5  3   2  3.45 1399/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.07

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  0  1  3  3   8  4.20 1191/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  2  4  1   9  4.06 1461/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  2  1  4   8  4.20  998/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   1  0  0  2  2  10  4.57  612/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 6  0  2  3  2   2  3.44 1070/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.52

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  1  3  11  4.50  397/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  2  3  10  4.53  603/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  1  0  3  1   9  4.21  937/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6  0  0  0  5   5  4.50  205/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.50

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0 0 0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  19  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****

              Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	2	B	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0302            University of Maryland                        Page 1421
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I         Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                  (Instr. C)   Fall  2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      36
Questionnaires:  20                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  2  3 15  4.65  419/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  3 17  4.85  176/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  203/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  2  0  0  4  0 14  4.56  432/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  2  0  3  5  6  3.81  996/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  200/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  1  3  2 14  4.45  613/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  424/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1  0  0  4  6  3  3.92 1090/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.07

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4  0  0  0  3  4  9  4.38 1034/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4  0  0  2  3  1 10  4.19 1427/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  2  2  3  9  4.19 1007/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4  1  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  579/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 6  0  3  2  2  2  3.33 1127/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.52

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  1  3 11  4.50  397/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  603/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  1  0  3  1  9  4.21  937/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                   4  6  0  0  0  5  5  4.50  205/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.50

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****

             Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0       A    9      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major        14
28-55      7       1.00-1.99    2       B    6
56-83      8       2.00-2.99    8       C    3      General              1    Under-grad   20      Non-major     6
84-150     2       3.00-3.49    3       D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2       F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                               responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               16
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0302             University of Maryland                        Page 1422
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I           Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                  (Instr. D)        Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      36
Questionnaires:  20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  2  3 15  4.65  419/1674  4.34 4.23  4.27 4.26  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  3 17  4.85  176/1674  4.25 4.18  4.23 4.21  4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  203/1423  4.36 4.23  4.27 4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  4  0 14  4.56  432/1609  4.27 4.23  4.22 4.27  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  2  0  3  5  6  3.81  996/1585  3.89 4.03  3.96 3.95  3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  200/1535  4.02 4.06  4.08 4.15  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  3  2 14  4.45  613/1651  4.20 4.24  4.18 4.16  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  424/1673  4.81 4.63  4.69 4.68  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  1  0  0  1  9  3  4.15  838/1656  3.99 4.01  4.07 4.07  4.07


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4  0  0  0  3  3 10  4.44  960/1586  4.38 4.38  4.43 4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4  0  0  2  2  1 11  4.31 1367/1585  4.29 4.60  4.69 4.66  4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  1  1  4 10  4.44  733/1582  4.23 4.26  4.26 4.26  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4  1  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  391/1575  4.34 4.29  4.27 4.25  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  6  0  2  3  2  2  3.44 1070/1380  3.95 3.96  3.94 4.01  3.52


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  1  3 11  4.50  397/1520  4.30 4.03  4.01 4.09  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  603/1515  4.25 4.27  4.24 4.32  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  1  0  3  1  9  4.21  937/1511  4.18 4.27  4.27 4.34  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  6  0  0  0  5  5  4.50  205/ 994  3.87 3.75  3.94 3.96  4.50


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 265  4.23 4.18  4.23 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 278  4.36 4.43  4.19 4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 260  4.37 4.45  4.46 4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 259  4.53 4.60  4.33 4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  3.00 3.00  4.20 4.18  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  **** 4.50  4.41 4.10  ****


            Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  **** ****  4.45 3.87  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0       A    9    Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0    Major       14
28-55     7       1.00-1.99    2       B    6
56-83     8       2.00-2.99    8       C    3    General               1    Under-grad   20    Non-major    6
84-150    2       3.00-3.49    3       D    0
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2       F    0    Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                              responses to be significant
                                        I    0    Other                16
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0303              University of Maryland                            Page 1423
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I            Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)        Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  406/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  168/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  203/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  3  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  343/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  3  5  2  5  3.60 1164/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  373/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  393/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  1  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   85/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.34

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  246/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  214/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  200/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.64

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  466/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  1  1  1  6  4.33  827/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  507/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  7  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99   1        A   8        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major      10
 28-55     4       1.00-1.99   0        B   3                                                               
 56-83     4       2.00-2.99   1        C   3        General              0      Under-grad  15      Non-major   5
 84-150    3       3.00-3.49   5        D   0                                                               
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   3        F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other               15
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0303            University of Maryland                              Page 1424
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I           Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:              (Instr. B)            Fall  2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


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

               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  406/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  168/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  203/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  343/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  3  5  2  5  3.60 1164/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  373/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  393/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 3  0  0  1  7  1  4.00  955/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.34

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  805/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44 1275/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  578/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  847/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  2  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  227/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.64

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  466/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  1  1  1  6  4.33  827/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  507/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   7  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   1         A   8        Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major       10
  28-55     4        1.00-1.99   0         B   3                                  
  56-83     4        2.00-2.99   1         C   3        General              0    Under-grad   15     Non-major    5
  84-150    3        3.00-3.49   5         D   0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   3         F   0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I   0        Other               15
                                           ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0303              University of Maryland                      Page 1425
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I             Baltimore County                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:              (Instr. C)               Fall  2005                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  15                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67  406/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  168/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  203/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  3  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  343/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  3  5  2  5  3.60 1164/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  373/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  393/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  3  0  0  1  6  2  4.11  882/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.34

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  663/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6  0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44 1275/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  180/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7  0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  551/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  2  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  227/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.64

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  466/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  1  1  1  6  4.33  827/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  507/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   6  7  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1        A    8       Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0       Major       10
 28-55      4       1.00-1.99    0        B    3                                                       
 56-83      4       2.00-2.99    1        C    3       General               0    Under-grad   15       Non-major    5
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49    5        D    0                                                        
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3        F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                15
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  0303                University of Maryland                                  Page 1426
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I             Baltimore County                                      JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                    (Instr. D)            Fall  2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 15                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   0   5  10  4.67   406/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   2  13  4.87   168/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0   0   0   3  12  4.80   203/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   3   0   0   0   4   7  4.64   343/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   3   5   2   5  3.60  1164/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   5   0   0   1   3   6  4.50   373/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   2   2  11  4.60   393/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00     1/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3   3   0   0   0   6   3  4.33   615/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.34

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       6   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67   663/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  6   0   0   1   0   1   7  4.56  1183/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  7   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   180/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    7   0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63   551/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  5   2   0   0   0   3   5  4.63   227/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.64

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6   0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44   466/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6   0   0   1   1   1   6  4.33   827/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6   0   0   0   1   1   7  4.67   507/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 6   7   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  ****/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  14   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1       A    8        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major       10
 28-55      4       1.00-1.99    0       B    3                                  
 56-83      4       2.00-2.99    1       C    3        General              0    Under-grad   15     Non-major    5
 84-150     3       3.00-3.49    5       D    0                                  
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               15
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  8020                University of Maryland                              Page 1427
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I              Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  Alonso                           Fall  2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires:  20                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   0   3   8   8  4.26  941/1674  4.34  4.23  4.27 4.26  4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   1   2   5  11  4.37  790/1674  4.25  4.18  4.23 4.21  4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   1   0   5   5   8  4.00 1016/1423  4.36  4.23  4.27 4.27  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1   0   0   4   4  10  4.33  743/1609  4.27  4.23  4.22 4.27  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   1   4   3  11  4.26  548/1585  3.89  4.03  3.96 3.95  4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4   0   0   2   4   9  4.47  427/1535  4.02  4.06  4.08 4.15  4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68  309/1651  4.20  4.24  4.18 4.16  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1673  4.81  4.63  4.69 4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   2   5   9  4.44  479/1656  3.99  4.01  4.07 4.07  4.44

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   0   1   7   9  4.47  901/1586  4.38  4.38  4.43 4.42  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   4  14  4.78  874/1585  4.29  4.60  4.69 4.66  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   1   4   3   9  4.18 1016/1582  4.23  4.26  4.26 4.26  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0   1   1   2  13  4.59  601/1575  4.34  4.29  4.27 4.25  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2   0   0   2   4   9  4.47  333/1380  3.95  3.96  3.94 4.01  4.47

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0   0   2   0   4   7  4.23  663/1520  4.30  4.03  4.01 4.09  4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0   0   1   1   5   6  4.23  914/1515  4.25  4.27  4.24 4.32  4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0   0   0   2   4   7  4.38  769/1511  4.18  4.27  4.27 4.34  4.38
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   2   0   1   2   4   4  4.00  474/ 994  3.87  3.75  3.94 3.96  4.00

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   14  0   2   2   2   0   0  2.00  265/ 265  4.23  4.18  4.23 4.26  2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0  0   3   2   1   0  2.67  272/ 278  4.36  4.43  4.19 4.24  2.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0   0   1   4   1   0  3.00  257/ 260  4.37  4.45  4.46 4.49  3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            14  0   0   2   2   1   1  3.17  249/ 259  4.53  4.60  4.33 4.33  3.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  14  0   1   1   2   1   1  3.00  221/ 233  3.00  3.00  4.20 4.18  3.00

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  1   0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41 4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 1  0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17  2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31 3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     17  1   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39 4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 17  1   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14 3.48  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98 4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93 3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        18  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45 3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    18  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12 3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18  0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27 3.27  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09 3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26 3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44 3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        19  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36 3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34 4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 331  8020              University of Maryland                    Page 1427
Title         EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I          Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   Alonso                        Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 20                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0       0.00-0.99    0       A    5       Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major       15
  28-55    0       1.00-1.99    0       B    4
  56-83    2       2.00-2.99    2       C    1       General              0     Under-grad  20       Non-major    5
  84-150   1       3.00-3.49    1       D    0
  Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    0       F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other               15
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1428
Title     EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II           Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   BLASS, THOMAS   (Instr. A)       Fall   2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  4                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  1  3  0  0  2.75 1650/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27 4.26  2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  2  2  0  0  2.50 1661/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23 4.21  2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1  1  1  1  0  2.50 1409/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27 4.27  2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  2  1  1  3.75 1320/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22 4.27  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  2  1  1  0  2.75 1517/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96 3.95  2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  1  0  1  2  4.00  870/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08 4.15  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1  1  1  1  0  2.50 1610/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18 4.16  2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  1  3  0  3.75 1640/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69 4.68  3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0  0  3  1  0  3.25 1474/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07 4.07  3.69

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  2  1  1  0  2.75 1562/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43 4.42  2.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  2  2  4.50 1225/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69 4.66  3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  3  0  1  0  2.50 1564/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26 4.26  2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  1  2  1  0  3.00 1487/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27 4.25  2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   2  1  0  0  0  1.33 1376/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94 4.01  2.58

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   1  1  1  1  0  2.50 1470/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01 4.09  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0  0  2  2  0  3.50 1303/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24 4.32  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0  0  1  3  0  3.75 1221/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27 4.34  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   3   1  0  0  0  0  1.00  988/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94 3.96  1.00
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0101           University of Maryland                              Page 1429
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   BLASS, THOMAS   (Instr. B)      Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:   4                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   3   0   0  2.75 1650/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  2.75
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   2   0   0  2.50 1661/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  2.50
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   1   1   0  2.50 1409/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  2.50
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 1320/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.75
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   2   1   1   0  2.75 1517/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  2.75
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00  870/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.00
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   1   1   0  2.50 1610/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  2.50
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   3   0  3.75 1640/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  3.75
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00  955/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.69


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 1573/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  2.31
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 1583/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  3.25
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 1564/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  2.25
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 1547/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  2.88
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 1217/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  2.58


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   1   1   1   0  2.50 1470/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  2.50
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   2   2   0  3.50 1303/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.50
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 1 3 0 3.75 1221/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.75
 4. Were special techniques successful                  0   3   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  988/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  1.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1430
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II        Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                 (Instr. C)    Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires:   4                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1650/1674	3.63	4.23	4.27	4.26	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1661/1674	3.62	4.18	4.23	4.21	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1409/1423	3.66	4.23	4.27	4.27	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1320/1609	4.21	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1517/1585	3.45	4.03	3.96	3.95	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	870/1535	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1610/1651	3.94	4.24	4.18	4.16	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1640/1673	4.46	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.56	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1585/1586	3.75	4.38	4.43	4.42	2.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1585/1585	4.13	4.60	4.69	4.66	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1581/1582	3.61	4.26	4.26	4.26	2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	3.73	4.29	4.27	4.25	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.48	3.96	3.94	4.01	2.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1470/1520	3.52	4.03	4.01	4.09	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1303/1515	3.99	4.27	4.24	4.32	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1221/1511	4.04	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	988/ 994	2.75	3.75	3.94	3.96	1.00

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1431
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II             Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                 (Instr. D)            Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires:  4                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   3   0   0  2.75 1650/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   2   0   0  2.50 1661/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   1   1   1   0  2.50 1409/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   1   1  3.75 1320/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   2   1   1   0  2.75 1517/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   1   0   1   2  4.00  870/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   1   1   0  2.50 1610/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   3   0  3.75 1640/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  381/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.69

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1539/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  2.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1504/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1487/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1217/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  2.58

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   1   1   1   0  2.50 1470/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   2   2   0  3.50 1303/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0   0   0   1   3   0  3.75 1221/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   3   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  988/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  1.00

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0102              University of Maryland                          Page 1432
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II              Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    BLASS, THOMAS   (Instr. A)          Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
Questionnaires: 16                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	1196/1674	3.63	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1104/1674	3.62	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1203/1423	3.66	4.23	4.27	4.27	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	852/1609	4.21	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	4	5	3	3.44	1274/1585	3.45	4.03	3.96	3.95	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	807/1535	4.13	4.06	4.08	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	1057/1651	3.94	4.24	4.18	4.16	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1375/1673	4.46	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	1090/1656	3.56	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	1144/1586	3.75	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1142/1585	4.13	4.60	4.69	4.66	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1099/1582	3.61	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1115/1575	3.73	4.29	4.27	4.25	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	998/1380	3.48	3.96	3.94	4.01	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	2	3	5	3.77	1018/1520	3.52	4.03	4.01	4.09	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1024/1515	3.99	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1216/1511	4.04	4.27	4.27	4.34	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	847/ 994	2.75	3.75	3.94	3.96	3.20

```
                                          Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0102           University of Maryland                             Page 1433
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II         Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:              (Instr. B)            Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires: 16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4   8   4  4.00 1196/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   3   6   6  4.06 1104/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   4   7   3  3.69 1203/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   7   7  4.25  852/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   4   4   5   3  3.44 1274/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1   1   1   5   8  4.13  807/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   2   4   8  4.06 1057/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   9   6  4.31 1375/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 2 1 0  2   2   0  3.00 1540/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.61

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        14  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   14  0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     14  1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.93

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3 0   0   3   2   3   5  3.77 1018/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3 0   1   0   3   3   6  4.00 1024/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0   1   2   2   2   6  3.77 1216/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.77
4. Were special techniques successful                    3 8   1   0   2   1   1  3.20  847/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.20

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1         0.00-0.99   0       A    2        Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0      Major      14
  28-55      0         1.00-1.99   0       B   10
  56-83      2         2.00-2.99   3       C    1        General              0      Under-grad   16      Non-major   2
  84-150     8         3.00-3.49   6       D    0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   2       F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other               15
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0102            University of Maryland                    Page 1434
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                 (Instr. C)           Fall   2005                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       16
Questionnaires:   16                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   4   8   4  4.00 1196/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   3   6   6  4.06 1104/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   4   7   3  3.69 1203/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   7   7  4.25  852/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   4   4   5   3  3.44 1274/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   1   1   5   8  4.13  807/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   2   4   8  4.06 1057/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   9   6  4.31 1375/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10  2   0   0   2   2   0  3.50 1377/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.61

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       13   0   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  13   0   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13  0   1   0   1   1   0  2.67 ****/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    13   1   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13  2   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.60

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3   0   0   3   2   3   5  3.77 1018/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3   0   1   0   3   3   6  4.00 1024/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3   0   1   2   2   2   6  3.77 1216/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.77
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   8   1   0   2   1   1  3.20  847/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.20

                                         Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                     Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0        A    2         Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0        Major       14
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B   10
  56-83      2       2.00-2.99    3        C    1         General               0      Under-grad  16        Non-major    2
  84-150     8       3.00-3.49    6        D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2        F    0         Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                15
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0102            University of Maryland                              Page 1435
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:              (Instr. D)            Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires:  16                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  4  8  4  4.00 1196/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  1  3  6  6  4.06 1104/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  2  4  7  3  3.69 1203/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  7  7  4.25  852/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  4  4  5  3  3.44 1274/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  1  1  1  5  8  4.13  807/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  1  1  2  4  8  4.06 1057/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  1  9  6  4.31 1375/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  6  1  0  0  2  5  2  4.00  955/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.61

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       11   0  0  0  0  5  0  4.00 1300/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  11   0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20 1423/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  11  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  998/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    11   0  0  1  0  3  1  3.80 1264/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  11  2  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.60

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  3  0  0  3  2  3  5  3.77 1018/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3  0  1  0  3  3  6  4.00 1024/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  3  0  1  2  2  2  6  3.77 1216/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.77
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   8  1  0  2  1  1  3.20  847/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.20
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0       A    2        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major      14
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0       B   10
  56-83     2       2.00-2.99   3       C    1        General              0    Under-grad   16     Non-major   2
  84-150    8       3.00-3.49   6       D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   2       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               15
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0103            University of Maryland                                        Page 1436
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  BLASS, THOMAS   (Instr. A)         Fall   2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 11                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0    0    0    0    4    4    3   3.91 1322/1674   3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0    0    0    2    4    1    4   3.64 1436/1674   3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0    0    0    0    3    5    3   4.00 1016/1423   3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0    0    0    1    0    2    8   4.55  443/1609   4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0    1    1    2    4    3   3.64 1142/1585   3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0    0    1    6    4   4.27  643/1535   4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0    0    0    0    2    1    8   4.55  471/1651   3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0    0    0    0    0    4    7   4.64 1103/1673   4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0   0    0    4    2    1   3.57 1344/1656   3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.43

                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0    0    0    0    2    4    5   4.27 1128/1586   3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0    0    0    1    0    0   10   4.73  981/1585   4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0    0    1    3    4    3   3.82 1266/1582   3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0    0    1    1    1    5    3   3.73 1304/1575   3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  4    2    1    2    0    2   2.86 1275/1380   3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.35

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0    1    1    2    2    2   3.38 1234/1520   3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0    1    1    1    1    4   3.75 1209/1515   3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0    1    0    1    1    5   4.13 1004/1511   4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                  3    6    1    0    0    0    1   3.00 ****/ 994   2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0103              University of Maryland                              Page 1437
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:              (Instr. B)         Fall  2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  11                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  4  4  3  3.91 1322/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  2  4  1  4  3.64 1436/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  3  5  3  4.00 1016/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  0  2  8  4.55  443/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  2  4  3  3.64 1142/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27  643/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  471/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64 1103/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  1  0  0  2  1  0  3.33 1444/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.43


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1300/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   7  0  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 1529/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 1129/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     7  0  0  1  1  0  2  3.75 1289/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  1  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 1036/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.35


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  1  2  2  2  3.38 1234/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  1  1  1  1  4  3.75 1209/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  1  0  1  1  5  4.13 1004/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  6  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0103           University of Maryland                           Page 1438
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:               (Instr. C)           Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   4   4   3  3.91 1322/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   2   4   1   4  3.64 1436/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   5   3  4.00 1016/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   1   0   2   8  4.55  443/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   1   2   4   3  3.64 1142/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   1   6   4  4.27  643/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   2   1   8  4.55  471/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64 1103/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7   1   0   0   3   0   0  3.00 1540/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.43

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0   0   1   1   2   1  3.60 1460/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    5   0   0   0   2   1   3  4.17 1434/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83 1255/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      5   0   0   1   2   1   2  3.67 1329/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5   1   1   0   1   0   3  3.80  866/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.35

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   1   1   2   2   2  3.38 1234/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   1   1   1   1   4  3.75 1209/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3   0   1   0   1   1   5  4.13 1004/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   6   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0103            University of Maryland                            Page 1439
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                (Instr. D)          Fall  2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  4  4  3  3.91 1322/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  2  4  1  4  3.64 1436/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  3  5  3  4.00 1016/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  2  8  4.55  443/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  2  4  3  3.64 1142/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  6  4  4.27  643/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  471/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64 1103/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0  0  2  3  1  3.83 1177/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.43

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       5   0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17 1211/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  4   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57 1166/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  748/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    4   0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  932/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4  1  0  1  1  1  3.25 1160/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.35

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0  1  1  2  2  2  3.38 1234/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0  1  1  1  1  4  3.75 1209/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1  0  1  1  5  4.13 1004/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   6  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0201            University of Maryland                               Page 1440
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II           Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  TENOWICH, PATRI                  Fall  2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  20                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  3  1  7  4  4  3.26 1581/1674  3.63 4.23  4.27 4.26  3.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  1  2  9  7  4.16 1035/1674  3.62 4.18  4.23 4.21  4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  1  0  8 10  4.42  672/1423  3.66 4.23  4.27 4.27  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  2  4  4  9  4.05 1061/1609  4.21 4.23  4.22 4.27  4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  3  1  3  4  6  3.53 1211/1585  3.45 4.03  3.96 3.95  3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  1  4  5  8  3.95  961/1535  4.13 4.06  4.08 4.15  3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  0  2  0  3 13  4.50  524/1651  3.94 4.24  4.18 4.16  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  424/1673  4.46 4.63  4.69 4.68  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  2  7  5  2  3.44 1407/1656  3.56 4.01  4.07 4.07  3.44

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  3  5 11  4.42  974/1586  3.75 4.38  4.43 4.42  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  1  9  9  4.42 1292/1585  4.13 4.60  4.69 4.66  4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  4  6  8  4.11 1079/1582  3.61 4.26  4.26 4.26  4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  1  1  1  5  3  8  3.89 1225/1575  3.73 4.29  4.27 4.25  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  1  0  5  6  7  3.95  744/1380  3.48 3.96  3.94 4.01  3.95

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  1  0  2  5  7  4.13  751/1520  3.52 4.03  4.01 4.09  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  603/1515  3.99 4.27  4.24 4.32  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  4  4  7  4.20  955/1511  4.04 4.27  4.27 4.34  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  6  0  0  3  1  4  4.13  432/ 994  2.75 3.75  3.94 3.96  4.13

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 265  3.50 4.18  4.23 4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 278  4.00 4.43  4.19 4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 260  4.50 4.45  4.46 4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 259  4.50 4.60  4.33 4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 233  **** 3.00  4.20 4.18  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  **** 4.50  4.41 4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 101  **** 4.58  4.48 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  95  **** 4.15  4.31 3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  99  **** 4.41  4.39 4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  **** 4.02  4.14 3.48  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0       A    7      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major       16
 28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0       B   10
 56-83     7       2.00-2.99    4       C    0      General              0    Under-grad   20     Non-major    4
 84-150    4       3.00-3.49    5       D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3       F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                               responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               18
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0202            University of Maryland                          Page 1441
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  TENOWICH, PATRI               Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires:  1                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1196/1674  3.63 4.23  4.27 4.26  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1146/1674  3.62 4.18  4.23 4.21  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1423  3.66 4.23  4.27 4.27  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1609  4.21 4.23  4.22 4.27  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1585  3.45 4.03  3.96 3.95  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1535  4.13 4.06  4.08 4.15  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1651  3.94 4.24  4.18 4.16  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1673  4.46 4.63  4.69 4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 1540/1656  3.56 4.01  4.07 4.07  3.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1586  3.75 4.38  4.43 4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1585  4.13 4.60  4.69 4.66  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1582  3.61 4.26  4.26 4.26  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1575  3.73 4.29  4.27 4.25  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00  666/1380  3.48 3.96  3.94 4.01  4.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1520  3.52 4.03  4.01 4.09  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1515  3.99 4.27  4.24 4.32  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1511  4.04 4.27  4.27 4.34  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00  881/ 994  2.75 3.75  3.94 3.96  3.00


                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0203            University of Maryland                              Page 1442
Title       EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  TENOWICH, PATRI                    Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires:  7                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  3  1  3  4.00 1196/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  191/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  819/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  812/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  3  1  2  3.83  976/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1  2  1  3  3.86 1066/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  432/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0  1  5  0  3.83 1177/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.83

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  974/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57 1166/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0  2  3  2  4.00 1129/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  1  1  0  5  4.29  932/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0  0  1  5  4.83  103/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.83

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0  1  1  2  4.25  645/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0  0  1  3  4.75  384/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 2  1  1  3.75 1221/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   1  1  0  1  1  0  2.67  954/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  2.67

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5   0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  229/ 265  3.50  4.18  4.23  4.26  3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0 2  0  4.00  188/ 278  4.00  4.43  4.19  4.24  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50  137/ 260  4.50  4.45  4.46  4.49  4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          5   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  115/ 259  4.50  4.60  4.33  4.33  4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0302              University of Maryland                                    Page 1443
Title        EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II          Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  GRONINGER, LOWE                Fall   2005                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires: 14                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0  1  1  3  2  5  3.75 1407/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  1  1  2  5  4  3.77 1364/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0  1  1  1  3  6  4.00 1016/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  2  0  2  4  5  3.77 1313/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  2  1  4  3  3  3.31 1344/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  0  4  3  4  3.54 1278/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  1  1  1  3  6  4.00 1097/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1  0  0  2  5  0  3.71 1267/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.71

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  774/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58 1158/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  2  5  5  4.25  935/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  0  1  4  6  4.17 1040/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  472/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.27

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  1  0  3  2  4  3.80  986/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  1  2  2  5  4.10  993/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  751/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   5  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  167/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.60

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11   1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 265  3.50  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 278  4.00  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 260  4.50  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/ 259  4.50  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 11  1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  3.27  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  3.20  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  3.50  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  3.82  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  3.29  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.29  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0302            University of Maryland                    Page 1443
Title         EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II        Baltimore County                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   GRONINGER, LOWE              Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2          0.00-0.99    0     A    1        Required for Majors  1     Graduate      0      Major          7
 28-55     1          1.00-1.99    0     B    6                                                        
 56-83     0          2.00-2.99    5     C    4        General              0     Under-grad   14      Non-major      7
 84-150    7          3.00-3.49    1     D    0                                                        
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00    3     F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               10
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 332  0303            University of Maryland                             Page 1444
Title      EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II           Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   GRONINGER, LOWE                   Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires: 18                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  1  0  2  9  5  4.00 1196/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   2   0  0  1  4  6  5  3.94 1233/1674  3.62  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0  2  3  0  4  7  3.69 1203/1423  3.66  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  2  7  7  4.31  771/1609  4.21  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1  1  1  3  5  4  3.71 1084/1585  3.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  0  0  3  5  7  4.27  655/1535  4.13  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3   0  0  1  0  5  9  4.47  583/1651  3.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                 4   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1673  4.46  4.63  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 1 0 5 3 3  3.58 1339/1656  3.56  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.58

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  2  1  4  9  4.25 1144/1586  3.75  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  2  1  2 11  4.38 1328/1585  4.13  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  2  2  3  4  5  3.50 1406/1582  3.61  4.26  4.26  4.26  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  2  2  1  4  7  3.75 1289/1575  3.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 1 0 3 0 11  4.33  426/1380  3.48  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.33

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  0  2  1  2  6  4.09  780/1520  3.52  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 0 1 1 8  4.36  798/1515  3.99  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 1 9  4.73  447/1511  4.04  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                 7   5  0  1  0  0  5  4.50  205/ 994  2.75  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.50

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00 ****/ 265  3.50  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 1 3  4.75 ****/ 278  4.00  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 15 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67 ****/ 260  4.50  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          15  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 259  4.50  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15 1 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.18  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0        A   7      Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0      Major      12
28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0        B   3
56-83     3      2.00-2.99   1        C   4      General              0    Under-grad  18     Non-major   6
84-150    5      3.00-3.49   8        D   0
Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   3        F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                                responses to be significant
                                      I   0      Other               16
                                      ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 335  0101           University of Maryland                          Page 1445
Title       PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO        Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PROVINE, ROBERT               Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    130
Questionnaires:  83                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0   1   3  15  22  38  4.18 1046/1674  4.49 4.23  4.27 4.26  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0   2  11  20  21  25  3.71 1401/1674  4.27 4.18  4.23 4.21  3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4   0   4   7  16  26  26  3.80 1158/1423  4.34 4.23  4.27 4.27  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4  56   5   2   5   5   6  3.22 1525/1609  3.87 4.23  4.22 4.27  3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   1   3   6  13  19  37  4.04  748/1585  4.20 4.03  3.96 3.95  4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 61  8   2   3   5   0  2.28 ****/1535  4.42 4.06  4.08 4.15  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0   2   4  11  12  50  4.32  795/1651  4.62 4.24  4.18 4.16  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0   0   0   0   3  76  4.96  283/1673  4.94 4.63  4.69 4.68  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0   3   2  26  31  16  3.71 1275/1656  4.18 4.01  4.07 4.07  3.71

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0   3   7  10  19  39  4.08 1265/1586  4.52 4.38  4.43 4.42  4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0   0   0   4   9  65  4.78  853/1585  4.89 4.60  4.69 4.66  4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   5  10  14  24  24  3.68 1344/1582  4.25 4.26  4.26 4.26  3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0   3   5  13  22  35  4.04 1126/1575  4.48 4.29  4.27 4.25  4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 50   9   6   4   4   3  2.46 1329/1380  3.61 3.96  3.94 4.01  2.46

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 35 0   9   7  11   8  13  3.19 1309/1520  3.55 4.03  4.01 4.09  3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 35 0   5   3  16   8  16  3.56 1285/1515  3.92 4.27  4.24 4.32  3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 35 0   2   4  11  12  19  3.88 1155/1511  4.30 4.27  4.27 4.34  3.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  34  45  0   0   2   1   1  3.75 ****/ 994  **** 3.75  3.94 3.96  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2        0.00-0.99    0      A   13      Required for Majors   2    Graduate     0     Major      53
  28-55    10        1.00-1.99    1      B   49
  56-83    22        2.00-2.99   16      C    7      General               7    Under-grad  83     Non-major  30
  84-150   20        3.00-3.49   23      D    2
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   11      F    0      Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                66
                                         ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 335  0201              University of Maryland                        Page 1446
Title      PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO           Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   MCGUIRE, LYNNAN               Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires:  37                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  12  0  0  0  0  5  20  4.80  243/1674  4.49  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   12  0  0  0  0  4  21  4.84  184/1674  4.27  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  12  0  0  0  0  3  22  4.88  146/1423  4.34  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   12  0  0  1  1  7  16  4.52  466/1609  3.87  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12 0  1  0  4  4  16  4.36  452/1585  4.20  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 12 1 0 1 2 7 14  4.42  494/1535  4.42  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           12  0  0  0  1  0  24  4.92   93/1651  4.62  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                 12  0  0  0  0  2  23  4.92  565/1673  4.94  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 20 0 0 0 0 6 11  4.65  274/1656  4.18  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.65


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       13  0  0  0  0  1  23  4.96  107/1586  4.52  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  13  0  0  0  0  0  24  5.00    1/1585  4.89  4.60  4.69  4.66  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 0 4 20  4.83  217/1582  4.25  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    13  0  0  0  0  2  22  4.92  154/1575  4.48  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 0 0 0 1 4 19  4.75  143/1380  3.61  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.75


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26 0 1 0 2 4 4  3.91  924/1520  3.55  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0 0 0 3 2 6  4.27  881/1515  3.92  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0 0 0 1 1 9  4.73  447/1511  4.30  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                 26  5  2  0  0  1   3  3.50 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                   Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0       A   17       Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0       Major       18
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    4                                                          
  56-83     3       2.00-2.99    7       C    3       General               1      Under-grad   37       Non-major   19
  84-150   14       3.00-3.49    7       D    0                                                          
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    5       F    0       Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                23
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 340  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1447
Title      SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY              Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    BLASS, THOMAS              Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    71
Questionnaires: 34                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  2  4 15 12  4.03 1179/1674  4.19  4.23  4.27 4.26  4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  2  4  8 12  8  3.59 1460/1674  3.90  4.18  4.23 4.21  3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  4  5  1 12 12  3.68 1209/1423  3.81  4.23  4.27 4.27  3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  1  1 10  7 12  3.90 1224/1609  3.95  4.23  4.22 4.27  3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  3  3  9 19  4.29  521/1585  4.41  4.03  3.96 3.95  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 5  4  6 12  7  3.35 1349/1535  3.69  4.06  4.08 4.15  3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  2  5 11 15  4.09 1044/1651  4.19  4.24  4.18 4.16  4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  1 21 12  4.32 1368/1673  4.63  4.63  4.69 4.68  4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1  3  7 12  6  3.66 1302/1656  3.83  4.01  4.07 4.07  3.66

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  2  4 10 18  4.29 1112/1586  4.41  4.38  4.43 4.42  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  1  5 27  4.71 1024/1585  4.80  4.60  4.69 4.66  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  6  7 10 11  3.76 1296/1582  4.09  4.26  4.26 4.26  3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  3  7 14  9  3.88 1230/1575  4.10  4.29  4.27 4.25  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4  3  3  6  9  7  3.50 1036/1380  3.66  3.96  3.94 4.01  3.50

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 7  1  5  4  5  2.95 1384/1520  3.64  4.03  4.01 4.09  2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 4  3  6  4  5  3.14 1407/1515  3.78  4.27  4.24 4.32  3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 2  1  5  9  5  3.64 1278/1511  4.26  4.27  4.27 4.34  3.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  12  11  3  2  2  2  2  2.82  935/ 994  3.32  3.75  3.94 3.96  2.82

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0       A   9      Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0      Major       22
 28-55      3      1.00-1.99   0       B  15
 56-83     12      2.00-2.99   6       C   6      General              2    Under-grad   34      Non-major   12
 84-150     8      3.00-3.49   9       D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   9       F   0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                               responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other               26
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 340  0201          University of Maryland                        Page 1448
Title      SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY              Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  Bediako, Shawn                  Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     59
Questionnaires:  34                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions             NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   1   2  11  19  4.35   829/1674  4.19  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   6  11  16  4.21   993/1674  3.90  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   3   6  11  13  3.94  1070/1423  3.81  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   1   1   6  14  11  4.00  1094/1609  3.95  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   3  10  21  4.53   313/1585  4.41  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1   2   6  11  14  4.03   861/1535  3.69  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   2   2  10  19  4.29   820/1651  4.19  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2  32  4.94   424/1673  4.63  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0   1   7  13   9  4.00   955/1656  3.83  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   1   1  10  19  4.52   847/1586  4.41  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   3  28  4.90   567/1585  4.80  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   1   3   9  18  4.42   762/1582  4.09  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   1   1   3   8  18  4.32   895/1575  4.10  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3  1   3   7   6  11  3.82   852/1380  3.66  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.82

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  1   1   0   9  13  4.33   572/1520  3.64  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  1   1   0   7  15  4.42   746/1515  3.78  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0   0   0   3  21  4.88   278/1511  4.26  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   2   1   2   3  10   6  3.82   609/ 994  3.32  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.82

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 33  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****

                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                   Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     2       0.00-0.99    0       A   2       Required for Majors  3    Graduate     0      Major        15
28-55     7       1.00-1.99    1       B  12
56-83     3       2.00-2.99   12       C  14       General              4    Under-grad  34      Non-major    19
84-150    9       3.00-3.49    5       D   1
Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3       F   0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other               21
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 342  0101              University of Maryland                        Page 1449
Title       PSYCH OF AGGRESSION             Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER                    Fall  2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    57
Questionnaires:  30                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  1  0  2  26  4.70   367/1674  4.80  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  2  1  8  19  4.47   641/1674  4.48  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  8  20  4.60   459/1423  4.47  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   9  2  0  1  2  16  4.43   614/1609  4.46  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  3  6  20  4.59   277/1585  4.59  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  6  0  2  6  13  3.74  1155/1535  4.20  4.06  4.08  4.15  3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   2  1  0  8  7  12  4.04  1077/1651  4.27  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  5  25  4.83   832/1673  4.82  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  9  21  4.70   230/1656  4.43  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.70

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  2  6  21  4.66   678/1586  4.78  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  0  28  4.93   397/1585  4.92  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  1  1  5  22  4.66   452/1582  4.68  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  1  0  0  4  24  4.72   407/1575  4.81  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  2  0  1  4  21  4.50   303/1380  4.40  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.50

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  2  0  2  3   8  4.00   810/1520  4.33  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  0  0  0  3  12  4.80   325/1515  4.84  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  0  0  0  2  13  4.87   289/1511  4.88  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.87
4. Were special techniques successful                   15 10  0  0  2  0   3  4.20  ****/ 994  4.50  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27       0      0.00-0.99    0      A   17      Required for Majors   5      Graduate      0       Major      15
  28-55       1      1.00-1.99    0      B    9
  56-83       4      2.00-2.99    6      C    2      General              12      Under-grad   30       Non-major  15
  84-150     12      3.00-3.49    6      D    0
  Grad.       0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                12
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 342  0201            University of Maryland                              Page 1450
Title       PSYCH OF AGGRESSION            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SCHULTZ, DAVID                     Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 14                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   4   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  148/1674  4.80  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  578/1674  4.48  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  771/1423  4.47  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  490/1609  4.46  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  265/1585  4.59  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 1 0  0  0  3  6  4.67  238/1535  4.20  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  524/1651  4.27  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  887/1673  4.82  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 1  0  2  3  4.17  827/1656  4.43  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.17


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  214/1586  4.78  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  567/1585  4.92  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  394/1582  4.68  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  192/1575  4.81  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 1  0  1  1  7  4.30  447/1380  4.40  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.30


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  295/1520  4.33  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  230/1515  4.84  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0  0  0  1  8  4.89  266/1511  4.88  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   1  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  205/ 994  4.50  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.50


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00  ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00  ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46  4.49  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 355  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1451
Title      COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY         Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: WISNIEWSKI, TIM               Fall  2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    38
Questionnaires: 23                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	195/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.18	4.23	4.21	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	9	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	825/1609	4.27	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	265/1585	4.60	4.03	3.96	3.95	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	12	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	340/1651	4.65	4.24	4.18	4.16	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	16	1	3.90	1624/1673	3.90	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	274/1656	4.65	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.60	4.69	4.66	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	452/1582	4.65	4.26	4.26	4.26	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.29	4.27	4.25	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.96	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	616/1520	4.29	4.03	4.01	4.09	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	568/1515	4.57	4.27	4.24	4.32	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	865/1511	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.34	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	396/ 994	4.18	3.75	3.94	3.96	4.18

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: PSYC 357  0101              University of Maryland                      Page 1452
Title      PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN              Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   O'BRIEN, EILEEN                  Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      34
Questionnaires: 25                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  3  2 20  4.68  393/1674  4.75  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  0  3 21  4.76  259/1674  4.66  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  1  4 19  4.64  404/1423  4.75  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  2  0  2  0  4 17  4.57  420/1609  4.51  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  1  2  1  3 15  4.32  502/1585  4.38  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 1  2  3 14  4.50  373/1535  4.53  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  2  1  1  4 16  4.29  820/1651  4.34  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2  0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91  635/1673  4.76  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2  3 18  4.70  230/1656  4.80  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.70

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  1  0  1 22  4.83  336/1586  4.94  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  0 24  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.60  4.69  4.66  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  0  0 23  4.88  180/1582  4.88  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  2 22  4.92  154/1575  4.89  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  0  1 22  4.96   40/1380  4.92  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.96

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  1  1  3 13  4.56  367/1520  4.49  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  124/1515  4.64  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0  1  1  0 16  4.72  447/1511  4.61  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.72
4. Were special techniques successful                   7  1  0  1  4  3  9  4.18  402/ 994  4.32  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.18
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A   11      Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0      Major       10
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B    8                                                    
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99   4      C    0      General              7    Under-grad   25     Non-major   15
 84-150     6      3.00-3.49   4      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               10
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 357  8020               University of Maryland                          Page 1453
Title        PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN                 Baltimore County                            JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  O'BRIEN, EILEEN                        Fall  2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      25
Questionnaires:  18                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                   Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                     NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   0   0   2   3  11  4.56   533/1674  4.75  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.56
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0   1   0   4  11  4.56   507/1674  4.66  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.56
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   0   0   1   4  11  4.63   431/1423  4.75  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.63
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   2   0   0   3   4   7  4.29   812/1609  4.51  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.29
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4   0   0   0   2   3   9  4.50   326/1585  4.38  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.50
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 2   0   0   1   3   8  4.58   301/1535  4.53  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.58
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             4   0   1   0   2   5   6  4.07  1050/1651  4.34  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.07
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   4   0   0   0   0   4  10  4.71  1015/1673  4.76  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.71
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70   230/1656  4.80  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.70


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   0  16  5.00     1/1586  4.94  4.38  4.43  4.42  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   0  16  5.00     1/1585  5.00  4.60  4.69  4.66  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   1   2  13  4.75   313/1582  4.88  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.75
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   0   1   2  13  4.75   359/1575  4.89  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.75
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0   0   0   1   1  13  4.80   114/1380  4.92  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.80


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   0   3   3   9  4.40   512/1520  4.49  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.40
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0   0   0   3   2  10  4.47   681/1515  4.64  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.47
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   0   0   2   2  11  4.60   563/1511  4.61  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.60
 4. Were special techniques successful                   3   6   1   2   0   1   5  3.78   628/ 994  4.32  3.75  3.94  3.96  3.78

            Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     17  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 17  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 357  8021            University of Maryland                              Page 1454
Title      PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN             Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    O'Brienm Eileen             Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires:  3                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1674   4.75  4.23  4.27  4.26  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  379/1674   4.66  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1423   4.75  4.23  4.27  4.27  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  312/1609   4.51  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  482/1585   4.38  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  0  0  1  1  4.50  373/1535   4.53  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  330/1651   4.34  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 1072/1673   4.76  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1656   4.80  4.01  4.07  4.07  5.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1586   4.94  4.38  4.43  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1585   5.00  4.60  4.69  4.66  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1582   4.88  4.26  4.26  4.26  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1575   4.89  4.29  4.27  4.25  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1380   4.92  3.96  3.94  4.01  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  397/1520   4.49  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  629/1515   4.64  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50  642/1511   4.61  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/ 994   4.32  3.75  3.94  3.96  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 370  0101              University of Maryland                                        Page 1455
Title      SENSATION AND PERCEPTI           Baltimore County                                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   PROVINE, ROBERT                  Fall   2005                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   135
Questionnaires: 78                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2   0   0   3   9  31  33  4.24  979/1674  4.24  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0   2   6  18  27  23  3.83 1326/1674  3.83  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   2   4  13  27  30  4.04  998/1423  4.04  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  61   2   4   3   5   1  2.93 ****/1609  ****  4.23  4.22  4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   2   5   8  20  19  21  3.59 1175/1585  3.59  4.03  3.96  3.95  3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5  54  10   4   1   2   2  2.05 ****/1535  ****  4.06  4.08  4.15  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   5   5  23  42  4.32  795/1651  4.32  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0   0   0   1   1  73  4.96  283/1673  4.96  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3   1   1   0  33  27  13  3.69 1286/1656  3.69  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.69


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   5  16  25  30  4.05 1275/1586  4.05  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   4   0  14  57  4.65 1083/1585  4.65  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   2  12  13  30  18  3.67 1348/1582  3.67  4.26  4.26  4.26  3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0   0   5   7  25  37  4.27  940/1575  4.27  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  31   9   5  14  11   5  2.95 1243/1380  2.95  3.96  3.94  4.01  2.95


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 37   0   7   5  15  10   4  2.98 1371/1520  2.98  4.03  4.01  4.09  2.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 37   0   7   6  10   8  10  3.20 1395/1515  3.20  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 38   0   7   8   9   7   9  3.08 1409/1511  3.08  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.08
4. Were special techniques successful                  38  35   0   1   1   1   2  3.80 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  75   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23  4.26  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 75   0   0   1   0   2   0  3.33 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19  4.24  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           76   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33  4.33  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0     A   22      Required for Majors  2      Graduate      0       Major        54
  28-55     11        1.00-1.99    0     B   32
  56-83     17        2.00-2.99   15     C   12      General              1      Under-grad   78       Non-major    24
  84-150    18        3.00-3.49   20     D    2
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   15     F    0      Electives            4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               64
                                        ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 380  0201            University of Maryland                                     Page 1456
Title       PERSONALITY                     Baltimore County                                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  PARKER, LESLIE                      Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 29                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0   0   3   2   7  16  4.29  916/1674  4.60  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0   0   1   2   3  22  4.64  406/1674  4.73  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0   0   1   1   3  23  4.71  310/1423  4.86  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  21   0   1   0   1   5  4.43 ****/1609  4.91  4.23  4.22  4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   1   3   5   2  16  4.07  722/1585  4.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 23  0   1   0   0   4  4.40 ****/1535  4.86  4.06  4.08  4.15  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0   2   0   0   1  25  4.68  319/1651  4.79  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   1   0   0  14  14  4.38 1332/1673  4.55  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1  0   0   3  10   9  4.27  693/1656  4.55  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.27

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   1   1   4  23  4.69  633/1586  4.73  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   1   0   1  27  4.86  664/1585  4.88  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   0   6  22  4.69  409/1582  4.80  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   1   0   5  22  4.59  601/1575  4.75  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 10  4   3   4   2   6  3.16 1193/1380  3.94  3.96  3.94  4.01  3.16

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0   1   5   1  11  4.22  673/1520  4.61  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0   1   2   2  13  4.50  629/1515  4.75  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0  0   3   0  15  4.67  507/1511  4.81  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                 11  15   1   0   0   0   2  3.67 ****/ 994  4.86  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    7        Required for Majors   4     Graduate     0        Major      19
  28-55      3      1.00-1.99    0       B   12
  56-83      7      2.00-2.99    4       C    3        General               2     Under-grad  29        Non-major  10
  84-150     5      3.00-3.49    4       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5       F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                16
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 380  8020                University of Maryland                              Page 1457
Title     PERSONALITY                          Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    Anderson, Rober                      Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 23                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                     General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  0  0  0  0  2  20  4.91  148/1674  4.60  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  4  19  4.83  199/1674  4.73  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2 14  0  0  0  0   7  5.00    1/1423  4.86  4.23  4.27  4.27  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  0  0  2  20  4.91  121/1609  4.91  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  4  18  4.82  131/1585  4.45  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  3  19  4.86  108/1535  4.86  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  0  2  20  4.91  116/1651  4.79  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  6  16  4.73 1001/1673  4.55  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10  1  0  0  0  2  10  4.83  136/1656  4.55  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.83


                     Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2  0  0  0  0  5  16  4.76  474/1586  4.73  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2  0  0  0  0  2  19  4.90  567/1585  4.88  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  2  19  4.90  152/1582  4.80  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2  0  0  0  0  2  19  4.90  171/1575  4.75  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  1  4  16  4.71  167/1380  3.94  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.71


                     Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  0  22  5.00    1/1520  4.61  4.03  4.01  4.09  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  0  22  5.00    1/1515  4.75  4.27  4.24  4.32  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  1  21  4.95  122/1511  4.81  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  1  0  0  0  3  18  4.86   86/ 994  4.86  3.75  3.94  3.96  4.86


                     Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  3.48  ****


                     Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.03  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  3.70  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  3.87  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  3.67  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  3.27  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major      13
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0      B    4
  56-83     1       2.00-2.99    0      C    2      General              6    Under-grad   23      Non-major  10
  84-150    1       3.00-3.49    2      D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                9
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 382  0201            University of Maryland                      Page 1458
Title     CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL           Baltimore County                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SCHAEFFER, CYNT              Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     59
Questionnaires:  40                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  1  2  4 32  4.72  342/1674  4.72  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.72
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  4 35  4.90  145/1674  4.90  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.90
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  1 38  4.97   40/1423  4.97  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.97
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  2  4 32  4.79  192/1609  4.79  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.79
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  1  0  0  4 11 20  4.46  369/1585  4.46  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.46
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 10 24  4.61  275/1535  4.61  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.61
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4   0  0  0  0  2 34  4.94   70/1651  4.94  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.94
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  4   0  0  0  1 13 22  4.58 1148/1673  4.58  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.58
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 3 10 22  4.54  352/1656  4.54  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.54


               Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  0  3 34  4.92  192/1586  4.92  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.92
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  1 36  4.97  170/1585  4.97  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.97
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  0  3 34  4.92  136/1582  4.92  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.92
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  3  1 33  4.81  268/1575  4.81  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.81
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 3  0  0  5  7 19  4.45  341/1380  4.45  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.45


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 1 1 5 11  4.26  635/1520  4.26  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.26
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 1 0 1 4 13  4.47  668/1515  4.47  4.27  4.24  4.32  4.47
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 1 0 1 5 12  4.42  729/1511  4.42  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.42
 4. Were special techniques successful                  22  13  2  1  0  1  1  2.60 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   25      Required for Majors   1      Graduate     0      Major       17
 28-55      5      1.00-1.99    0      B    7
 56-83     10      2.00-2.99    9      C    4      General              13      Under-grad  40      Non-major   23
 84-150    15      3.00-3.49   14      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    7      F    0      Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                21
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 385  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1459
Title      HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY              Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  ANDERSON, ROBER                  Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     39
Questionnaires: 35                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   6  27  4.69  380/1674  4.69  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.69
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   8  24  4.60  460/1674  4.60  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.60
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   7  25  4.63  431/1423  4.63  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.63
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  22   1   0   0   1  11  4.62  363/1609  4.62  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.62
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   0   0   5   4  24  4.58  283/1585  4.58  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.58
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 22  0   0   1   0  11  4.83  119/1535  4.83  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.83
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   2   1   5   4  22  4.26  855/1651  4.26  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.26
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   1  20  13  4.35 1347/1673  4.35  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.35
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   0   1  10  24  4.66  266/1656  4.66  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.66


             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   6  26  4.76  496/1586  4.76  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.76
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   1  32  4.97  227/1585  4.97  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.97
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   1   0   4  27  4.78  272/1582  4.78  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.78
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   1   0   0  32  4.91  171/1575  4.91  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.91
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 6  1   2   4   5  13  4.08  630/1380  4.08  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.08


             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  0   2   1   2  14  4.47  431/1520  4.47  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.47
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  0   0   0   0  19  5.00    1/1515  5.00  4.27  4.24  4.32  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0   0   0   1  18  4.95  146/1511  4.95  4.27  4.27  4.34  4.95
 4. Were special techniques successful                  16  12  0   0   1   1   5  4.57 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A    22      Required for Majors  5    Graduate      0     Major      19
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B     9
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99    4      C     2      General              6    Under-grad   35     Non-major  16
 84-150    13       3.00-3.49    9      D     0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    3      F     0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P     0                               responses to be significant
                                       I     0      Other               20
                                       ?     1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 390  0101           University of Maryland                            Page 1460
Title    NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG           Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RABIN, BERNARD             Fall  2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    41
Questionnaires: 24                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   1   4   4  14  4.35   841/1674  4.35  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   1   6  10   6  3.91  1258/1674  3.91  4.18  4.23  4.21  3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0   1   2   4   8   7  3.82  1150/1423  3.82  4.23  4.27  4.27  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  20   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  ****/1609  ****  4.23  4.22  4.27  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2   0   1   4   5  10  4.20   612/1585  4.20  4.03  3.96  3.95  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 22  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/1535  ****  4.06  4.08  4.15  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1   0   0   4   0  18  4.64   361/1651  4.64  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   5   8   3   7  3.52  1652/1673  3.52  4.63  4.69  4.68  3.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   1   5   9   4  3.84  1169/1656  3.84  4.01  4.07  4.07  3.84

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   7  16  4.70   618/1586  4.70  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   6  17  4.74   960/1585  4.74  4.60  4.69  4.66  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   4   6  12  4.26   924/1582  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   2   9  12  4.43   780/1575  4.43  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2   0   0   2   5  14  4.57   259/1380  4.57  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.57

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0   1   0   3   6   3  3.77  1018/1520  3.77  4.03  4.01  4.09  3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0   1   2   3   2   5  3.62  1270/1515  3.62  4.27  4.24  4.32  3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  0   3   4   1   5  3.62  1286/1511  3.62  4.27  4.27  4.34  3.62
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  11  0   0   1   0   1  4.00  ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0          A    6        Required for Majors   1      Graduate     0         Major       16
 28-55      2       1.00-1.99    0          B    7
 56-83      3       2.00-2.99    4          C    5        General               8      Under-grad  24         Non-major    8
 84-150    12       3.00-3.49    8          D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    6          F    0        Electives             3      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    3                                     responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                10
                                            ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 393  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1461
Title       SPECIAL TOPICS IN PSYC          Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: RICHMAN, DAVID                     Fall  2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires:  11                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82   233/1674   4.82  4.23  4.27  4.26  4.82
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70   338/1674   4.70  4.18  4.23  4.21  4.70
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73   298/1423   4.73  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.73
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64   343/1609   4.64  4.23  4.22  4.27  4.64
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1585   5.00  4.03  3.96  3.95  5.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82   127/1535   4.82  4.06  4.08  4.15  4.82
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  0  9  4.64   361/1651   4.64  4.24  4.18  4.16  4.64
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  7  3  4.30  1383/1673   4.30  4.63  4.69  4.68  4.30
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  0  5  6  4.55   352/1656   4.55  4.01  4.07  4.07  4.55


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82   371/1586   4.82  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.82
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00     1/1585   5.00  4.60  4.69  4.66  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73   353/1582   4.73  4.26  4.26  4.26  4.73
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  0  0 10  4.73   407/1575   4.73  4.29  4.27  4.25  4.73
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0  1  0  3  5  4.33   426/1380   4.33  3.96  3.94  4.01  4.33


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   213/1520   4.78  4.03  4.01  4.09  4.78
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1515   5.00  4.27  4.24  4.32  5.00
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00     1/1511   5.00  4.27  4.27  4.34  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  2   8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 994   ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 393S 8020                  University of Maryland                            Page 1462
Title      ADDICTIONS                            Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   ALLEN, JOHN                          Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 31                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 10  0  1   3   2   6   9  3.90 1322/1674  3.90  4.23  4.27 4.26  3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  10  0  0   3   3   3  12  4.14 1043/1674  4.14  4.18  4.23 4.21  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 10  0  1   1   4   7   8  3.95 1061/1423  3.95  4.23  4.27 4.27  3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  10  1  1   1   4   5   9  4.00 1094/1609  4.00  4.23  4.22 4.27  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 10  0  0   1   2   5  13  4.43  395/1585  4.43  4.03  3.96 3.95  4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 10  5  1   0   3   5   7  4.06  844/1535  4.06  4.06  4.08 4.15  4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          10  1  1   3   1   6   9  3.95 1162/1651  3.95  4.24  4.18 4.16  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                10  1  0   0   0   7  13  4.65 1082/1673  4.65  4.63  4.69 4.68  4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13  1  1   0   6   8   2  3.59 1339/1656  3.59  4.01  4.07 4.07  3.59

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      11  0  1   0   4   4  11  4.20 1191/1586  4.20  4.38  4.43 4.42  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11  0  0   1   0   3  16  4.70 1035/1585  4.70  4.60  4.69 4.66  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11  0  1   1   2   6  10  4.15 1034/1582  4.15  4.26  4.26 4.26  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   11  1  2   1   4   2  10  3.89 1220/1575  3.89  4.29  4.27 4.25  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 12  2   0   2   2   2  3.25 1160/1380  3.25  3.96  3.94 4.01  3.25

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19  0  0   0   1   2   9  4.67  295/1520  4.67  4.03  4.01 4.09  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19  0  0   0   1   0  11  4.83  289/1515  4.83  4.27  4.24 4.32  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19  0  0   0   0   1  11  4.92  219/1511  4.92  4.27  4.27 4.34  4.92
4. Were special techniques successful                19  8  0   0   1   0   3  4.50 ****/ 994  **** 3.75  3.94 3.96  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 30  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 103  **** 4.50  4.41 4.10  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 30  0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 101  **** 4.58  4.48 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 30  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  95  **** 4.15  4.31 3.91  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  30  0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  99  **** 4.41  4.39 4.29  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear              30  0  0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  97  **** 4.02  4.14 3.48  ****

                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0      A   12        Required for Majors   3    Graduate       0      Major      19
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99   0      B    6
  56-83     4       2.00-2.99   2      C    0        General               7    Under-grad    31      Non-major  12
  84-150    8       3.00-3.49   6      D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   4      F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                10
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 393S 8021                    University of Maryland                         Page 1463
Title       ADDICTIONS                             Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    ALLEN, JOHN                            Fall   2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 14                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 407  0101               University of Maryland                        Page 1464
Title        ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY               Baltimore County                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  SONNENSCHEIN, S                    Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     32
Questionnaires:  28                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   2   3  10  12  4.07 1139/1674  4.07  4.23  4.27  4.42  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   3   5  13   7  3.86 1305/1674  3.86  4.18  4.23  4.31  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   4   9  14  4.29  819/1423  4.29  4.23  4.27  4.34  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   0   4  14   9  4.07 1048/1609  4.07  4.23  4.22  4.30  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   3   5  12   7  3.75 1049/1585  3.75  4.03  3.96  4.01  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1   2   2   4   8  11  3.89 1039/1535  3.89  4.06  4.08  4.18  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   3   4   9  12  4.07 1050/1651  4.07  4.24  4.18  4.23  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  27  4.96  283/1673  4.96  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1   1  10  13   1  3.46 1394/1656  3.46  4.01  4.07  4.19  3.46


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   6   7  13  4.19 1198/1586  4.19  4.38  4.43  4.46  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   2   3  22  4.74  938/1585  4.74  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   1   0  10  11   5  3.70 1333/1582  3.70  4.26  4.26  4.31  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   0   3  13  10  4.15 1060/1575  4.15  4.29  4.27  4.35  4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0   1   4   7   6   6  3.50 1036/1380  3.50  3.96  3.94  4.04  3.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   1   0   3   9   9  4.14  751/1520  4.14  4.03  4.01  4.18  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   3   5  14  4.50  629/1515  4.50  4.27  4.24  4.40  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0   0   2   5   3  12  4.14  997/1511  4.14  4.27  4.27  4.45  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   6   0   3   3   6   4  3.69  669/ 994  3.69  3.75  3.94  4.19  3.69


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0       A    4       Required for Majors   2    Graduate     0     Major       27
 28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0       B   14
 56-83      2     2.00-2.99   10       C    8       General               3    Under-grad  28     Non-major    1
 84-150    14     3.00-3.49    5       D    0
 Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    2       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                20
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 424  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1465
Title      INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   FOX, MARY H                     Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      45
Questionnaires:  33                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0  1  0  4 13 13  4.19 1026/1674  4.19  4.23  4.27 4.42  4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  1  2  5 12 11  3.97 1196/1674  3.97  4.18  4.23 4.31  3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0  1  3  5  5 17  4.10  962/1423  4.10  4.23  4.27 4.34  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0  1  1  5  7 17  4.23  892/1609  4.23  4.23  4.22 4.30  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3   0  1  2  6  9 12  3.97  824/1585  3.97  4.03  3.96 4.01  3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  1  1  8  6 14  4.03  857/1535  4.03  4.06  4.08 4.18  4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3   0  1  5  4  7 13  3.87 1252/1651  3.87  4.24  4.18 4.23  3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled                   3   0  0  0  0 13 17  4.57 1162/1673  4.57  4.63  4.69 4.67  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1 1  1  7  8  5  3.68 1286/1656  3.68  4.01  4.07 4.19  3.68

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  1  3  2 13 12  4.03 1285/1586  4.03  4.38  4.43 4.46  4.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  1  0  1  5 24  4.65 1094/1585  4.65  4.60  4.69 4.76  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  2  2  3 12 12  3.97 1164/1582  3.97  4.26  4.26 4.31  3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  1  2  3  8 17  4.23  983/1575  4.23  4.29  4.27 4.35  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  1  2  5 11 11  3.97  718/1380  3.97  3.96  3.94 4.04  3.97

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  2  0  3 10  4.40  512/1520  4.40  4.03  4.01 4.18  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53  603/1515  4.53  4.27  4.24 4.40  4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0  0  1  1  4  9  4.40  751/1511  4.40  4.27  4.27 4.45  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   18  1  0  0  3  4  7  4.29  346/ 994  4.29  3.75  3.94 4.19  4.29

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   26  1  0  0  0  1  5  4.83 ****/ 265  ****  4.18  4.23 4.53  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 0  1  0  1  5  4.43 ****/ 278  ****  4.43  4.19 4.21  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 1  0  1  1  1  3  4.00 ****/ 260  ****  4.45  4.46 4.24  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            26  0  1  0  0  1  5  4.29 ****/ 259  ****  4.60  4.33 4.31  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  26  1  0  1  0  1  4  4.33 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20 4.10  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   23      Required for Majors  1    Graduate      0    Major      18
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    4
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    0      C    0      General              3    Under-grad   33    Non-major  15
 84-150    13      3.00-3.49    8      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               23
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 437  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1466
Title       MAKING A DIFFERENCE                Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  MATON, KENNETH                       Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires: 14                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64  432/1674  4.64  4.23  4.27  4.42  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64  406/1674  4.64  4.18  4.23  4.31  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  12  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1423  ****  4.23  4.27  4.34  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  1  6  5  4.33  743/1609  4.33  4.23  4.22  4.30  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  2  2  3  7  4.07  722/1585  4.07  4.03  3.96  4.01  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  7  7  4.50  373/1535  4.50  4.06  4.08  4.18  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  0  2 11  4.57  432/1651  4.57  4.24  4.18  4.23  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  814/1673  4.85  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  359/1656  4.54  4.01  4.07  4.19  4.54


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  162/1520  4.86  4.03  4.01  4.18  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1515  5.00  4.27  4.24  4.40  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1511  5.00  4.27  4.27  4.45  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   1  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  111/ 994  4.77  3.75  3.94  4.19  4.77


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1   0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62   52/ 103  4.62  4.50  4.41  4.42  4.62
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 1  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85   41/ 101  4.85  4.58  4.48  4.65  4.85
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69   36/  95  4.69  4.15  4.31  4.60  4.69
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69   42/  99  4.69  4.41  4.39  4.57  4.69
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 1   0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77   30/  97  4.77  4.02  4.14  4.46  4.77


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   1       A   11        Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0      Major      8
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B    2
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1       C    0        General              3    Under-grad  14      Non-major  6
 84-150     7      3.00-3.49   2       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   3       F    0        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               10
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 475  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1467
Title      CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY            Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  DELUTY, ROBERT               Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    31
Questionnaires: 24                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  0  3  5 15  4.38  804/1674   4.46  4.23  4.27  4.42  4.38
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  1  1  9 12  4.25  931/1674   4.10  4.18  4.23  4.31  4.25
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  3  0  9 12  4.25  845/1423   4.23  4.23  4.27  4.34  4.25
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  5  3  2  5  3  6  3.37 1493/1609   3.87  4.23  4.22  4.30  3.37
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 1 1 5 14  4.22  593/1585   4.35  4.03  3.96  4.01  4.22
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5 3 4 5 3 3  2.94 1456/1535   3.54  4.06  4.08  4.18  2.94
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  1  1  1  3 17  4.48  568/1651   3.76  4.24  4.18  4.23  4.48
 8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0 13 10  4.43 1278/1673   4.26  4.63  4.69  4.67  4.43
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 0 2 9 12 4.29 667/1656   4.46  4.01  4.07  4.19  4.29


               Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  1  0  2  5 16  4.46  931/1586   4.60  4.38  4.43  4.46  4.46
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  1  0  1 22  4.83  737/1585   4.90  4.60  4.69  4.76  4.83
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 1 6 16 4.50  632/1582   4.69  4.26  4.26  4.31  4.50
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  1  0  1  4 18  4.58  601/1575   4.54  4.29  4.27  4.35  4.58
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7 1 2 3 6 5  3.71  938/1380   3.74  3.96  3.94  4.04  3.71


               Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 6 7 10  4.04  796/1520   4.35  4.03  4.01  4.18  4.04
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 1 0 3 1 19  4.54  594/1515   4.67  4.27  4.24  4.40  4.54
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 2 2 3 4 13  4.00 1050/1511   4.45  4.27  4.27  4.45  4.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                 0 21  3  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 994   4.43  3.75  3.94  4.19  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 475  8020                University of Maryland                              Page 1468
Title      CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY                   Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   ANDERSON, ROBER                        Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires:  24                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  2  7 15  4.54  558/1674  4.46 4.23  4.27 4.42  4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  4 13  6  3.96 1208/1674  4.10 4.18  4.23 4.31  3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  3  6 13  4.21  887/1423  4.23 4.23  4.27 4.34  4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  3  7 11  4.38  673/1609  3.87 4.23  4.22 4.30  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  3  6 14  4.48  352/1585  4.35 4.03  3.96 4.01  4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0  1  0  2 10  8  4.14  787/1535  3.54 4.06  4.08 4.18  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  3  5  9  2  5  3.04 1559/1651  3.76 4.24  4.18 4.23  3.04
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0 21  2  4.09 1533/1673  4.26 4.63  4.69 4.67  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  1  7 16  4.63  292/1656  4.46 4.01  4.07 4.19  4.63

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  4 19  4.75  496/1586  4.60 4.38  4.43 4.46  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96  284/1585  4.90 4.60  4.69 4.76  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  3 21  4.88  180/1582  4.69 4.26  4.26 4.31  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  3  6 15  4.50  692/1575  4.54 4.29  4.27 4.35  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  7  2  0  3  7  5  3.76  894/1380  3.74 3.96  3.94 4.04  3.76

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  1  0  4 15  4.65  302/1520  4.35 4.03  4.01 4.18  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  325/1515  4.67 4.27  4.24 4.40  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  2 18  4.90  244/1511  4.45 4.27  4.27 4.45  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   6  0  0  2  4  8  4.43  270/ 994  4.43 3.75  3.94 4.19  4.43
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0        A    4        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0        Major       18
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    9
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0        C    1        General               1     Under-grad   24        Non-major    6
  84-150     5       3.00-3.49    4        D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    5        F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                13
                                           ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1469
Title       COMM/SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY          Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  STAFF                          Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires:  4                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1511/1674  3.50  4.23  4.27  4.44  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  1  1  3.50 1499/1674  3.50  4.18  4.23  4.34  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 1377/1609  3.67  4.23  4.22  4.34  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  326/1585  4.50  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 0 1 0 0  2.00 1524/1535  2.00  4.06  4.08  4.27  2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  866/1651  4.25  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 0 1  3.50 1377/1656  3.50  4.01  4.07  4.15  3.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 1579/1586  2.00  4.38  4.43  4.50  2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1574/1585  3.00  4.60  4.69  4.79  3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1504/1582  3.00  4.26  4.26  4.33  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 1487/1575  3.00  4.29  4.27  4.30  3.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  397/1520  4.50  4.03  4.01  4.19  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1515  5.00  4.27  4.24  4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 1 1 2  4.25  896/1511  4.25  4.27  4.27  4.49  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/ 994  5.00  3.75  3.94  4.07  5.00

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   71/ 103  4.25  4.50  4.41  4.56  4.25
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 2 0 0 0 0 2  5.00    1/ 101  5.00  4.58  4.48  4.62  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   62/  95  4.00  4.15  4.31  4.43  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  1  0  1  2  4.00   70/  99  4.00  4.41  4.39  4.54  4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                0   0  0  1  0  2  1  3.75   69/  97  3.75  4.02  4.14  4.26  3.75

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page 1471
Title       NEONATAL CARE                          Baltimore County                                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   HUSSEY-GARDNER,                          Fall   2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  3                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1674   5.00  4.23  4.27 4.44  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1674   5.00  4.18  4.23 4.34  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1423   5.00  4.23  4.27 4.28  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  743/1609   4.33  4.23  4.22 4.34  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  769/1585   4.00  4.03  3.96 4.23  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 1  3.67 1207/1535   3.67  4.06  4.08 4.27  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  330/1651   4.67  4.24  4.18 4.32  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 1361/1673   4.33  4.63  4.69 4.78  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 3  5.00    1/1656   5.00  4.01  4.07 4.15  5.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1586   5.00  4.38  4.43 4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1585   5.00  4.60  4.69 4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1582   5.00  4.26  4.26 4.33  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1575   5.00  4.29  4.27 4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67  200/1380   4.67  3.96  3.94 3.85  4.67
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 601E 0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1472
Title        CORE I                             Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  WALDSTEIN, SHAR                      Fall  2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 19                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  3  4  9  3  3.63 1464/1674  3.63  4.23  4.27  4.44  3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  2  6  8  3  3.63 1436/1674  3.63  4.18  4.23  4.34  3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2  13   0  2  0  0  2  3.50 ****/1423  ****  4.23  4.27  4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   1  2  4  5  7  3.79 1299/1609  3.79  4.23  4.22  4.34  3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1  2  2 12  2  3.63 1142/1585  3.63  4.03  3.96  4.23  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4   0  1  4  6  4  3.87 1057/1535  3.87  4.06  4.08  4.27  3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  3  5  6  5  3.68 1368/1651  3.68  4.24  4.18  4.32  3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 4  0  0  7  3  2  3.58 1339/1656  3.58  4.01  4.07  4.15  3.58

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        17   0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1586  ****  4.38  4.43  4.50  ****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   17   0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1585  ****  4.60  4.69  4.79  ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17  0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1582  ****  4.26  4.26  4.33  ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     17   0   0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1575  ****  4.29  4.27  4.30  ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17 1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1380  ****  3.96  3.94  3.85  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0   1  1  0  1  0  2.33 ****/1520  ****  4.03  4.01  4.19  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1515  ****  4.27  4.24  4.47  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1511  ****  4.27  4.27  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  16   2   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  4.07  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0   0   0  1  1  9  8  4.26   70/ 103  4.26  4.50  4.41  4.56  4.26
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0  0   0  1  1  6 11  4.42   63/ 101  4.42  4.58  4.48  4.62  4.42
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0   2   0  1  4  4  8  4.12   61/  95  4.12  4.15  4.31  4.43  4.12
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  1  3  6  9  4.21   62/  99  4.21  4.41  4.39  4.54  4.21
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                0   0   2  2  4  7  4  3.47   78/  97  3.47  4.02  4.14  4.26  3.47

                                  Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type               Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3         0.00-0.99   0       A   13        Required for Majors   0    Graduate    14      Major       0
 28-55     0         1.00-1.99   0       B    3
 56-83     0         2.00-2.99   0       C    0        General               0    Under-grad   5      Non-major  19
 84-150    0         3.00-3.49   3       D    0
 Grad.    14         3.50-4.00   5       F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                18
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 601F 0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1473
Title       CORE I                          Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  BAKER, LINDA                       Fall  2005                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 18                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  2  6  6  4  3.67 1449/1674  3.67  4.23  4.27  4.44  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  2  5  7  4  3.72 1388/1674  3.72  4.18  4.23  4.34  3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0 13  0  2  0  0  3  3.80 1155/1423  3.80  4.23  4.27  4.28  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  4  5  7  3.94 1172/1609  3.94  4.23  4.22  4.34  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  3 10  3  3.78 1032/1585  3.78  4.03  3.96  4.23  3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  1  3  7  4  3.93  976/1535  3.93  4.06  4.08  4.27  3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  2  5  5  6  3.83 1270/1651  3.83  4.24  4.18  4.32  3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  4  1  0  3  5  2  3.64 1313/1656  3.64  4.01  4.07  4.15  3.64

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      15  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1586  ****  4.38  4.43  4.50  ****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 15  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1585  ****  4.60  4.69  4.79  ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1582  ****  4.26  4.26  4.33  ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   16  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1575  ****  4.29  4.27  4.30  ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1380  ****  3.96  3.94  3.85  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0  1  1  0  1  0  2.33 ****/1520  ****  4.03  4.01  4.19  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/1515  ****  4.27  4.24  4.47  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1511  ****  4.27  4.27  4.49  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                15  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  4.07  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0  0  0  1  1 10  6  4.17   73/ 103  4.17  4.50  4.41  4.56  4.17
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0  0  0  1  1  5 11  4.44   61/ 101  4.44  4.58  4.48  4.62  4.44
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  4  4  8  4.25   58/  95  4.25  4.15  4.31  4.43  4.25
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   0  0  0  1  3  6  8  4.17   65/  99  4.17  4.41  4.39  4.54  4.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               0  0  1  2  4  7  4  3.61   75/  97  3.61  4.02  4.14  4.26  3.61

                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 605  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1474
Title     LEARNING AND COGNITION              Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   CATANIA, A. CHA                  Fall   2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires:  14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   2   4   5   3  3.64 1459/1674  3.64  4.23  4.27  4.44  3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   3   3   4   3  3.36 1553/1674  3.36  4.18  4.23  4.34  3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   2   2   5   3   2  3.07 1356/1423  3.07  4.23  4.27  4.28  3.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   1   4   5   3  3.57 1423/1609  3.57  4.23  4.22  4.34  3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   2   4   7  4.38  432/1585  4.38  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   2   5   4   3  3.57 1256/1535  3.57  4.06  4.08  4.27  3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   1  11  4.64  351/1651  4.64  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  14  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0   1   4   7   1  3.62 1324/1656  3.62  4.01  4.07  4.15  3.62

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   3   2   4   5  3.79 1406/1586  3.79  4.38  4.43  4.50  3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  13  4.93  453/1585  4.93  4.60  4.69  4.79  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   4   5   2   3  3.29 1467/1582  3.29  4.26  4.26  4.33  3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   2   4   3   3  3.21 1455/1575  3.21  4.29  4.27  4.30  3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   3   2   4   4  3.69  944/1380  3.69  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.69

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   3   2   5   2   2  2.86 1419/1520  2.86  4.03  4.01  4.19  2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   1   3   2   8  4.21  930/1515  4.21  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  1   1   5   2   5  3.64 1274/1511  3.64  4.27  4.27  4.49  3.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   3   0   2   2   5   2  3.64  687/ 994  3.64  3.75  3.94  4.07  3.64
```

```
                                     Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons               Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     4          0.00-0.99   1        A    4       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      7     Major        2
  28-55     0          1.00-1.99   0        B    9
  56-83     1          2.00-2.99   0        C    0       General              0     Under-grad    7     Non-major   12
  84-150    0          3.00-3.49   0        D    0
  Grad.     7          3.50-4.00   4        F    0       Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                            I    0       Other               13
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 607  0101              University of Maryland                          Page 1475
Title      DEV PSYCHOPATHOLOGY              Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   SCHAEFFER, CYNT                 Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  0  2  5  4.71   342/1674  4.71  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  1  6  4.86   176/1674  4.86  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1423  5.00  4.23  4.27  4.28  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  2  4  4.43   614/1609  4.43  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  0  0  2  5  4.71   191/1585  4.71  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  2  1  4  4.29   631/1535  4.29  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1651  5.00  4.24  4.18  4.32  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  6  1  4.14  1497/1673  4.14  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0   0   0  0  0  5  2  4.29   680/1656  4.29  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.29

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  2  5  4.71   581/1586  4.71  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  1  6  4.86   689/1585  4.86  4.60  4.69  4.79  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0  0  1  0  6  4.71   366/1582  4.71  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  0  0  1  6  4.86   225/1575  4.86  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   0   1  0  3  1  2  3.43  1082/1380  3.43  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.43

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  1  0  2  4  4.29   616/1520  4.29  4.03  4.01  4.19  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0   0   0  0  1  0  6  4.71   432/1515  4.71  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0   0   0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1511  5.00  4.27  4.27  4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 0   5   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/ 994  5.00  3.75  3.94  4.07  5.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 611  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1476
Title      DATA ANALYTIC PROC I              Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)        Fall   2005                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    36
Questionnaires: 13                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean   Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1674   5.00   4.23  4.27  4.44  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2  10  4.69  338/1674   4.69   4.18  4.23  4.34  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1423   5.00   4.23  4.27  4.28  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   0   4   8  4.67  312/1609   4.67   4.23  4.22  4.34  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   1   0   0   4   7  4.33  482/1585   4.33   4.03  3.96  4.23  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   2  11  4.85  116/1535   4.85   4.06  4.08  4.27  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   4   8  4.54  484/1651   4.54   4.24  4.18  4.32  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  13  5.00    1/1673   5.00   4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0   0   0   4   8  4.67  257/1656   4.25   4.01  4.07  4.15  4.25

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00    1/1586   4.59   4.38  4.43  4.50  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00    1/1585   4.67   4.60  4.69  4.79  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   1   1  10  4.75  313/1582   4.54   4.26  4.26  4.33  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   1   0  11  4.83  246/1575   4.28   4.29  4.27  4.30  4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7  0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1380   4.80   3.96  3.94  3.85  4.80

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   2   1   3  4.17  726/1520   4.17   4.03  4.01  4.19  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0   1   1   0   1   3  3.67 1253/1515   3.67   4.27  4.24  4.47  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0   0   4   0   2  3.67 1265/1511   3.67   4.27  4.27  4.49  3.67

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   0   0   0   1   3   3  4.29  141/ 265   4.29   4.18  4.23  4.51  4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0  0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/ 278   5.00   4.43  4.19  4.42  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0  0   0   1   0   5  4.67  102/ 260   4.67   4.45  4.46  4.67  4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/ 259   5.00   4.60  4.33  4.66  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6   4   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/ 233   ****   3.00  4.20  4.53  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 103   ****   4.50  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 101   ****   4.58  4.48  4.62  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  95   ****   4.15  4.31  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  99   ****   4.41  4.39  4.54  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  97   ****   4.02  4.14  4.26  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  76   ****   ****  3.98  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  77   ****   ****  3.93  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53   ****   ****  4.45  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48   ****   ****  4.12  4.35  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  49   ****   ****  4.27  4.46  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  61   ****   ****  4.09  4.46  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52   ****   ****  4.26  4.59  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  50   ****   ****  4.44  4.64  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35   ****   ****  4.36  4.84  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     12   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  31   ****   ****  4.34  4.64  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 611  0101                University of Maryland                      Page 1476
Title          DATA ANALYTIC PROC I            Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)      Fall   2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     36
Questionnaires: 13                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                   Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99    2        A    6       Required for Majors   0        Graduate    11        Major         0
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    7
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0        C    0       General               0        Under-grad   2        Non-major    13
 84-150     0       3.00-3.49    0        D    0
 Grad.     11       3.50-4.00    0        F    0       Electives             0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                13
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 611  0101            University of Maryland                          Page 1477
Title       DATA ANALYTIC PROC I          Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                (Instr. B)     Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      36
Questionnaires: 13                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1674  5.00  4.23  4.27  4.44  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  338/1674  4.69  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1423  5.00  4.23  4.27  4.28  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  312/1609  4.67  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  0  0  4  7  4.33  482/1585  4.33  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  2 11 4.85  116/1535  4.85  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  484/1651  4.54  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 4 6 2 3.83 1177/1656 4.25  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.25

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  2  5  4  4.18 1198/1586  4.59  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  1  6  5  4.33 1354/1585  4.67  4.60  4.69  4.79  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0  0  0  2  4  6  4.33  850/1582  4.54  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  6  2  3  3.73 1304/1575  4.28  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 0  1  2  7  4.60  241/1380  4.80  3.96  3.94  3.85  4.80

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0  2  1  3  4.17  726/1520  4.17  4.03  4.01  4.19  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 1  0  1  3  3.67 1253/1515  3.67  4.27  4.24  4.47  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 4 0 2 3.67 1265/1511 3.67  4.27  4.27  4.49  3.67

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6   0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  141/ 265  4.29  4.18  4.23  4.51  4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00   1/ 278  5.00  4.43  4.19  4.42  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 1 0 5 4.67  102/ 260  4.67  4.45  4.46  4.67  4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          6   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/ 259  5.00  4.60  4.33  4.66  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6  4  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.00  4.20  4.53  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103 ****  4.50  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101 ****  4.58  4.48  4.62  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 95 ****  4.15  4.31  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.54  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  4.26  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 76 ****  ****  3.98  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 ****  ****  3.93  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.35  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 ****  ****  4.27  4.46  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 61 ****  ****  4.09  4.46  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.59  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.64  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.84  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.64  ****
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 611  0101              University of Maryland               Page 1477
Title          DATA ANALYTIC PROC I          Baltimore County                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:                    (Instr. B)    Fall   2005                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      36
Questionnaires:  13                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                  Type                      Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99    2        A    6        Required for Majors   0    Graduate    11      Major       0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0        B    7
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General               0    Under-grad   2      Non-major  13
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49    0        D    0
 Grad.    11        3.50-4.00    0        F    0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                13
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 615  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1478
Title        METH APPL BEHAV AN               Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  DELEON, ISER                       Fall  2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires: 11                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  233/1674  4.82  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  138/1674  4.91  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  195/1423  4.82  4.23  4.27  4.28  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  252/1609  4.73  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  185/1585  4.73  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 4 5  4.27  643/1535  4.27  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  361/1651  4.64  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 10  1  4.09 1529/1673  4.09  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 2 8  4.80  149/1656  4.80  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.80


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1586  5.00  4.38  4.43  4.50  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.60  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 10  5.00    1/1582  5.00  4.26  4.26  4.33  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1575  5.00  4.29  4.27  4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 2 1 8  4.55  278/1380  4.55  3.96  3.94  3.85  4.55


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 6  4.55  373/1520  4.55  4.03  4.01  4.19  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 1 9  4.73  420/1515  4.73  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 1 2 8  4.64  535/1511  4.64  4.27  4.27  4.49  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  6  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  167/ 994  4.60  3.75  3.94  4.07  4.60


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 0 0 0 0 0 9  5.00    1/ 103  5.00  4.50  4.41  4.56  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 3 0 0 0 2 4  4.67   51/ 101  4.67  4.58  4.48  4.62  4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2 3 0 0 2 2 2  4.00   62/  95  4.00  4.15  4.31  4.43  4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   37/  99  4.78  4.41  4.39  4.54  4.78
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                2  0  1  1  1  1  5  3.89   64/  97  3.89  4.02  4.14  4.26  3.89

                                         Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 620  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1479
Title        METHODS OF ASSESSMENT           Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  DELUTY, ROBERT                     Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
```

```
Questionnaires:  12                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  214/1674  4.83  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  6  6  4.50  578/1674  4.50  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  771/1423  4.33  4.23  4.27  4.28  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  397/1609  4.58  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  2  3  6  4.17  642/1585  4.17  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  238/1535  4.67  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  2  8  4.50  524/1651  4.50  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58 1148/1673  4.58  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  8  2  4.09  900/1656  4.09  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.09


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  192/1586  4.92  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.60  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  217/1582  4.83  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  246/1575  4.83  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  7  1  1  0  2  0  2.75 1290/1380  2.75  3.96  3.94  3.85  2.75


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  1  1  4  6  4.25  645/1520  4.25  4.03  4.01  4.19  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0  1  0  0  0 11  4.67  483/1515  4.67  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  1  1  2  2  6  3.92 1130/1511  3.92  4.27  4.27  4.49  3.92
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   3  0  0  0  1  8  4.89   81/ 994  4.89  3.75  3.94  4.07  4.89


                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 623  0101            University of Maryland                                Page 1480
Title        CLINICAL INTERVENTN II        Baltimore County                                    JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  DICLEMENTE, CAR               Fall   2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  8                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies        Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38   804/1674   4.38  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.38
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   4   3  4.25   931/1674   4.25  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.25
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   771/1423   4.33  4.23  4.27  4.28  4.33
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50   490/1609   4.50  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.50
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   3   4   1  3.75  1049/1585   3.75  4.03  3.96  4.23  3.75
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   4   3   1  3.63  1229/1535   3.63  4.06  4.08  4.27  3.63
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   1   5  4.38   713/1651   4.38  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.38
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   760/1673   4.88  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.88
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0   0   7   1  4.13   871/1656   4.13  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.13

            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   5   3  4.38  1034/1586   4.38  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.38
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88   640/1585   4.88  4.60  4.69  4.79  4.88
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   7   0  3.88  1233/1582   3.88  4.26  4.26  4.33  3.88
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   5   2  4.13  1080/1575   4.13  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.13
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0   0   3   2   2  3.86   831/1380   3.86  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.86

            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   3   3   2  3.88   942/1520   3.88  4.03  4.01  4.19  3.88
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   3   5  4.63   523/1515   4.63  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.63
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1511   5.00  4.27  4.27  4.49  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  0   5   0   0   1   1   1  4.00   474/ 994   4.00  3.75  3.94  4.07  4.00

                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 635  0101                  University of Maryland                                    Page 1481
Title        COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY                   Baltimore County                                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  BRODSKY, ANNE                             Fall  2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires:  14                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank       Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  2  4  5  2  3.36 1558/1674  3.36  4.23  4.27  4.44  3.36
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  2  5  4  2  3.29 1571/1674  3.29  4.18  4.23  4.34  3.29
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  2  2  5  3  2  3.07 1356/1423  3.07  4.23  4.27  4.28  3.07
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  1  3  3  5  1  3.15 1539/1609  3.15  4.23  4.22  4.34  3.15
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  2  1  4  6  3.86  956/1585  3.86  4.03  3.96  4.23  3.86
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 2 3 5 2 3.21 1402/1535  3.21  4.06  4.08  4.27  3.21
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  1  1  1  5  6  4.00 1097/1651  4.00  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0 13  1  4.07 1537/1673  4.07  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.07
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 2 4 2 3.67 1297/1656  3.67  4.01  4.07  4.15  3.67


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  2  1  2  2  7  3.79 1406/1586  3.79  4.38  4.43  4.50  3.79
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  453/1585  4.93  4.60  4.69  4.79  4.93
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 0 2 3 7  3.93 1199/1582  3.93  4.26  4.26  4.33  3.93
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  2  1  1  3  7  3.86 1240/1575  3.86  4.29  4.27  4.30  3.86
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 2 1 1 2 3 3.33 1127/1380  3.33  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.33


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 6 0 5 3.43 1210/1520  3.43  4.03  4.01  4.19  3.43
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 1 2 10 4.50  629/1515  4.50  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.50
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 3 4 6 4.07 1027/1511  4.07  4.27  4.27  4.49  4.07
 4. Were special techniques successful                 0  1  1  0  4  6  2  3.62  695/ 994  3.62  3.75  3.94  4.07  3.62


              Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 103  ****  4.50  4.41  4.56  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.62  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/  95  ****  4.15  4.31  4.43  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  4.41  4.39  4.54  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear               13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  4.02  4.14  4.26  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 651  0101              University of Maryland                         Page 1482
Title       COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT            Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: SONNENSCHEIN, S                  Fall   2005                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 13                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75   298/1674   4.75  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   3   7   2  3.92  1258/1674   3.92  4.18  4.23  4.34  3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   1   1   7   3  4.00  1016/1423   4.00  4.23  4.27  4.28  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2   5   5  4.25   852/1609   4.25  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67   224/1585   4.67  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   0   0   0   8   4  4.33   578/1535   4.33  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   1   2   2   4   3  3.50  1442/1651   3.50  4.24  4.18  4.32  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00     1/1673   5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   1   8   2  4.09   900/1656   4.09  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.09


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   1   6   4  4.08  1260/1586   4.08  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00     1/1585   5.00  4.60  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   3   5   4  4.08  1089/1582   4.08  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   2   1   2   7  4.17  1040/1575   4.17  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2   1   0   3   4   2  3.60   998/1380   3.60  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.60


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   1   1   1   8  4.45   454/1520   4.45  4.03  4.01  4.19  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82   313/1515   4.82  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   1   1   4   5  4.18   962/1511   4.18  4.27  4.27  4.49  4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3   0   0   3   3   2  3.88   581/ 994   3.88  3.75  3.94  4.07  3.88


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    3       0.00-0.99   0        A   8         Required for Majors  0    Graduate     7     Major       1
  28-55    0       1.00-1.99   0        B   4
  56-83    0       2.00-2.99   0        C   0         General              2    Under-grad   6     Non-major  12
  84-150   1       3.00-3.49   1        D   0
  Grad.    7       3.50-4.00   6        F   0         Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0         Other                9
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 655  0101            University of Maryland                    Page 1483
Title      ADV TOP A BEHAV AN              Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   KAHNG, SUNG W                Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  10             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  485/1674  4.60  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  215/1674  4.80  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   8  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1423  ****  4.23  4.27  4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  374/1609  4.60  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   86/1585  4.90  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  1  1  7  4.67  238/1535  4.67  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  298/1651  4.70  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1673  5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  1  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  292/1656  4.63  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.63


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  723/1586  4.63  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.60  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  180/1582  4.88  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  0  1  1  5  4.13 1080/1575  4.13  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  5  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 1036/1380  3.50  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.50


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1520  5.00  4.03  4.01  4.19  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  360/1515  4.78  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1511  5.00  4.27  4.27  4.49  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   5  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/ 994  5.00  3.75  3.94  4.07  5.00


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      3      0.00-0.99   0        A    8      Required for Majors   0     Graduate      6      Major        0
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0        B    1
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0        C    0      General               0     Under-grad    4      Non-major   10
  84-150     0      3.00-3.49   0        D    0
  Grad.      6      3.50-4.00   5        F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                10
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: PSYC 695A 0101          University of Maryland                                    Page 1484
Title        CHILD HEALTH                  Baltimore County                                       JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  DAHLQUIST, LYNN                    Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  243/1674  4.80  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  460/1674  4.60  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1423  ****  4.23  4.27  4.28  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  645/1609  4.40  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  413/1585  4.40  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  870/1535  4.00  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  175/1651  4.80  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  887/1673  4.80  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  955/1656  4.00  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.00

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  858/1586  4.50  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1585  5.00  4.60  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  313/1582  4.75  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  958/1575  4.25  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1380  ****  3.96  3.94  3.85  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  191/1520  4.80  4.03  4.01  4.19  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1515  5.00  4.27  4.24  4.47  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  563/1511  4.60  4.27  4.27  4.49  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  3  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  205/ 994  4.50  3.75  3.94  4.07  4.50

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   48/ 103  4.67  4.50  4.41  4.56  4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   51/ 101  4.67  4.58  4.48  4.62  4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   54/  95  4.33  4.15  4.31  4.43  4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/  99  5.00  4.41  4.39  4.54  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   34/  97  4.67  4.02  4.14  4.26  4.67

                                      Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 695B 0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1485
Title       CLIN INTERVENTIONS III        Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   MCGUIRE, LYNNAN             Fall   2005                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires: 10                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   5   3   4.10 1115/1674  4.10  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.10
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   7   3   4.30  870/1674   4.30  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.30
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   8   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/1423  ****  4.23  4.27  4.28  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2   4   3   4.11 1018/1609  4.11  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.11
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   2   5   3   4.10  702/1585   4.10  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.10
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   3   3   4   4.10  828/1535   4.10  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.10
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   5   4   4.30  809/1651   4.30  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.30
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0  10   5.00    1/1673   5.00  4.63  4.69  4.78  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   1   1   7   1   3.80 1200/1656  3.80  4.01  4.07  4.15  3.80


            Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   1   4   3   4.25 1144/1586  4.25  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.25
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   1   8   4.89  615/1585   4.89  4.60  4.69  4.79  4.89
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   6   3   4.33  850/1582   4.33  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.33
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   4   2   3   3.89 1225/1575  3.89  4.29  4.27  4.30  3.89
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  0   0   2   3   1   3.83  845/1380   3.83  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.83


            Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   0   1   5   3   3.90  924/1520   3.90  4.03  4.01  4.19  3.90
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   2   1   7   4.50  629/1515   4.50  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.50
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   1   4   5   4.40  751/1511   4.40  4.27  4.27  4.49  4.40
 4. Were special techniques successful                  1   7   0   0   0   1   1   4.50 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  4.07  ****


            Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3  0   0   0   0   0   7   5.00    1/ 103   5.00  4.50  4.41  4.56  5.00
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 1  0   0   2   2   2   4.00   72/ 101   4.00  4.58  4.48  4.62  4.00
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3  1   0   1   2   1   2   3.67   76/  95   3.67  4.15  4.31  4.43  3.67
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    3   0   0   0   2   3   2   4.00   70/  99   4.00  4.41  4.39  4.54  4.00
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                3   1   0   0   2   2   2   4.00   50/  97   4.00  4.02  4.14  4.26  4.00


                              Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 695C 0101           University of Maryland                                      Page 1486
Title      PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY            Baltimore County                                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   RABIN, BERNARD             Fall   2005                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    14
Questionnaires: 11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   2   3   5  4.09 1123/1674  4.09  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   1   2   3   4  4.00 1146/1674  4.00  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   1   2   6  4.56  517/1423  4.56  4.23  4.27  4.28  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/1609  ****  4.23  4.22  4.34  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   1   3   5  4.20  612/1585  4.20  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8  0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/1535  ****  4.06  4.08  4.27  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   3   3   4  4.10 1031/1651  4.10  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   8   3  4.27 1405/1673  4.27  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0   0   4   4   2  3.80 1200/1656  3.80  4.01  4.07  4.15  3.80

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55  816/1586  4.55  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55 1191/1585  4.55  4.60  4.69  4.79  4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   2   2   1   6  4.00 1129/1582  4.00  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   3   1   6  4.09 1103/1575  4.09  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  1   0   0   4   5  4.20  540/1380  4.20  3.96  3.94  3.85  4.20

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   2   3   1   0   1  2.29 1493/1520  2.29  4.03  4.01  4.19  2.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   2   2   1   1   1  2.57 1467/1515  2.57  4.27  4.24  4.47  2.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0   1   0   4   1   1  3.14 1396/1511  3.14  4.27  4.27  4.49  3.14
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   6   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94  4.07  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00   74/ 103  4.00  4.50  4.41  4.56  4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 2  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  4.58  4.48  4.62  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: PSYC 715  0101            University of Maryland                           Page 1487
Title      MEASUREMENT OF BEHAVIO          Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  STAPLETON, LAUR              Fall  2005                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     9
Questionnaires:  8                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50   607/1674  4.50  4.23  4.27  4.44  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50   578/1674  4.50  4.18  4.23  4.34  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   167/1423  4.86  4.23  4.27  4.28  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   222/1609  4.75  4.23  4.22  4.34  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   251/1585  4.63  4.03  3.96  4.23  4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   200/1535  4.71  4.06  4.08  4.27  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50   524/1651  4.50  4.24  4.18  4.32  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  7  1  4.13  1511/1673  4.13  4.63  4.69  4.78  4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  6  2  4.25   719/1656  4.25  4.01  4.07  4.15  4.25


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   581/1586  4.71  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1585  5.00  4.60  4.69  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   748/1582  4.43  4.26  4.26  4.33  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   423/1575  4.71  4.29  4.27  4.30  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  0  0  2  2  0  3.50  1036/1380  3.50  3.96  3.94  3.85  3.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  1  0  1  4  1  3.57  1141/1520  3.57  4.03  4.01  4.19  3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   266/1515  4.86  4.27  4.24  4.47  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29   865/1511  4.29  4.27  4.27  4.49  4.29
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   4  0  0  2  1  0  3.33   811/ 994  3.33  3.75  3.94  4.07  3.33


                              Frequency Distribution

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