Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 172 Questionnaires: 70

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1393 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	encie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	6	15	23	21	3.78	1363/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	6	20	27	14	3.65	1395/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	14	33	17	3.94	1024/1421	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.11	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	29	2	1	10	20	6	3.69	1284/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	4	6	22	33	4.29	524/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	55	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	****/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	9	14	22	22	3.81	1250/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	64	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	3	3	15	27	8	3.61	1312/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	3.61
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	2	0	2	0	2	29	35	4.40	964/1514	4.65	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	9	58	4.82	732/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	7	13	28	18		1225/1503		4.18	4.24	4.17	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	3	9	28	19		1277/1506		4.23	4.26	4.17	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	3	13	22	26	4.02	582/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.02
Discussion		_	_	_		_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	9	5	11	7	7		1361/1490		3.87	4.05	3.85	2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	3	7	13	7	10		1352/1502		4.18	4.26	4.06	3.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	5	2	11	9	13		1249/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	29	32	4	1	2	1	1	2.33	****/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
T - 1														
Laboratory	F 1	0	0	3	_	5	2	2 45	**** / OOC	****	4 00	4 00	2 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	-	0	6 3	5 7	3		****/ 226		4.08	4.20	3.98	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0			8	4.28	111/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.28
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	4	0		3	2	10	4.47	,	****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52 52	10 7	1 0	0 1	2	2 1	3 7		****/ 223 ****/ 206	****	4.51 4.69	4.35	4.19 4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	52	/	U	1	2	Т	/	4.27	/ 206		4.09	4.15	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	62	6	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	,	****	3.56	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	62	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	62	4	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	7	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.90	****
or word directia for grading made drear	0.5	•	Ü	Ū	ŭ	_	Ū	1.00	, , ,		5.55	3.75	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	,	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	3	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	65	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	65	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	65	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 172
Questionnaires: 70

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1393 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	3	 А	20	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	14	General	4	Under-grad	70	Non-major	69
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Title Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 168 Questionnaires: 93 Fall 2006

Page 1394 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	3	2	14	33	36		1103/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	3	17	24	42		1001/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	3	9	31	44	4.30	781/1421	4.28	4.15		4.11	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	32	2	3	8	18	25	4.09	981/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	3	2	9	22	49	4.32	508/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	54	3	0	8	8	14		1019/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	14	27	44	4.30	817/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	1	84	4.97		4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	1	3	21	32	12	3./4	1225/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	3	20	61	4.62	663/1514	4.65	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	16	67	4.73	917/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	0	8	28	48	4.40	730/1503	4.41	4.18		4.17	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	5	8	19	51	4.28	892/1506	4.32	4.23	4.26	4.17	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	1	5	16	61	4.61	219/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	7	5	13	10	15	3.42	1202/1490	3.73	3.87	4.05	3.85	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	5	4	19	8	15		1312/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.06	3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	3	4	8	16	20		1125/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	42	23	6	4	6	5	7	3.11	920/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	3.11
Laboratory														
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	1	1	0	2	3	5	4 00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	3.98	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	****/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	4	0	1	1	1	4			****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	5	2	0	1	0	3			****	4.51	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	5	1	0	1	1	3		****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.01	****
o. Here requirements for raw reperts orearry specifical	02	3	_	ŭ	_	_		3.03	, 200		1.05	1115	1.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	85	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	85	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	84	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	84	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.90	***
-1 11 ··· 1														
Field Work	0.0	0	0	0	•	0	-	0 00	50	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	2	2	0	0	1		****/ 58		****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87 87	3 5	1	0	1	0	1 1	3.00	****/ 40 ****/ 30	****	****	3.97 4.33	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8 /	5	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/ 30			4.33	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	84	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	4	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	***

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 168
Questionnaires: 93

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1394 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	26	0.00-0.99	7	Α	34	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	26						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	93	Non-major	85
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 159 Questionnaires: 78

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1395 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	4	17	50	4.65	419/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	9	22	41	4.44	634/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	9	20	39	4.32	755/1421	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	21	0	3	7	13	27	4.28	770/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	1	2	0	5	19	41	4.45	398/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	41	1	1	3	10	11	4.12	819/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	5	16	22	24	3.88	1178/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	68	4.99	143/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	0	1	27	43	4.59	305/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	1	17	49	4.66	584/1514	4.65	4.35	4.39	4.32	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	2	66	4.94	307/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	18	47	4.65	412/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.17	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	14	52	4.72	394/1506	4.32	4.23	4.26	4.17	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	4	8	17	32	4.21	477/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	6	12	23	4.33	622/1490	3.73	3.87	4.05	3.85	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	2	0	1	9	30	4.55	595/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.06	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	1	5	36	4.83	348/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	36	31	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	****/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	72	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	73	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar		_	_	_										
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	75	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.90	****
mini di manda														
Field Work	7.5	0	^	0	0	^	2	F 00	**** / FO	****		4 00	4 00	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 52		****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	75	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 42	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74 74	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.75	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7 <del>4</del> 75	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	75 75	0	0	1	1	0	_		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.23	****
J. HOLE CHOICE CHOUGH PLOCEOLS TOL ALL CHE SCUGETES	13	J	U	Τ.	Τ.	U	Τ.	5.33	/ 49			T.JT	7.44	

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 159
Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1395 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	A	19	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	78	Non-major	73
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	6						

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: SPIEGELMAN, JAS

Enrollment: 115 Questionnaires: 71

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1396 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	1	21	45	4.54	545/1669	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.02	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	13	55	4.76	243/1666	4.25	4.13	4.19	4.11	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	14	48	4.55	511/1421	4.28	4.15	4.24	4.11	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	4	6	6	34	4.40	641/1617	4.12	4.15	4.15	3.99	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	16	46	4.58	277/1555	4.41	4.05	4.00	3.92	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	45	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	503/1543	4.15	4.00	4.06	3.86	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	13	54	4.75	213/1647	4.19	4.15	4.12	4.06	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	0	67	4.94	428/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	11	56	4.81	139/1605	4.19	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.81
Lecture	2	0	0	0	1	4	<i>c</i> 2	4 01	170/1514	4 65	4 25	4 20	4 20	4 01
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4 2	63	4.91			4.35	4.39	4.32	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	-	0	-	1	_	66	4.94	307/1551	4.86	4.66	4.66	4.55	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0		1 1	3	4 12		4.81	210/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.17	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1 0	1 3	3	4		50	4.60	547/1506	4.32	4.23	4.26	4.17	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	U	3	3	6	13	43	4.32	397/1311	4.29	4.08	3.85	3.68	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	4	6	8	30	4.20	742/1490	3.73	3.87	4.05	3.85	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	3	4	6	31	4.12	962/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.06	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	1	5	6	36	4.53	657/1489	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.07	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	24	23	2	1	4	7	10	3.92	594/1006	3.51	3.84	4.00	3.81	
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	5	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	5	1	1	3	4	3.00	****/ 233	4.28	4.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	7	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	6	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.01	****
Quantity and														
Seminar	г.о	0	0	0	0	1	4	4 00	<b>4444/110</b>	****	1 06	4 20	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	8	0	0	0	1	4		****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	11	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 97		3.56	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	13	0	0	1	0	1 2	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58 58	9 9	0	0	2 1	0	_		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	4.06	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	9	U	U	1	U	3	4.50	***/ 98		3.39	3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	5	0	1	4	2	2.83	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	4	1	1	1	5		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	9	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	5	1	0	2	1	3		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	7	1	0	1	1	2		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
				-					,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	1	1	3	10	4.06	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	2	0	0	4	11	4.29	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	4	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	7	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	9	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: SPIEGELMAN, JAS

Enrollment: 115
Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1396 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	А	19	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	32						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	13	Under-grad	71	Non-major	63
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	3						

CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID

Enrollment: 92
Questionnaires: 91

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1397 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		1															
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	General ew insights,skills fi	com this course	48	0	1	5	5	11	21	4 07	1131/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.07
		ctor make clear the		48	0	1	5	9	10	18		1235/1666	4.22	4.13	4.19	4.29	3.91
		uestions reflect the		48	0	2	4	7	12	18		1033/1421	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.35	3.93
	_	uations reflect the e		48	17	2	2	5	5	12		1179/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.88
		eadings contribute to		49	0	1	4	0	11	26	4.36	477/1555	4.24	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.36
		signments contribute		49	31	1	1	2	4	3		****/1543	4.01	4.00	4.06	4.10	***
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly exp	lained -	49	0	0	3	3	6	30	4.50	481/1647	4.49	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.50
8. How ma	any times	was class cancelled		49	0	0	0	1	14	27	4.62	1115/1668	4.74	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.62
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	56	1	4	0	7	14	9	3.71	1249/1605	3.96	3.94	4.07	4.15	3.71
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lectures well	l prepared	50	0	2	1	1	7	30	4.51	787/1514	4.59	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.51
		ctor seem interested		49	0	0	1	1	8	32	4.69	986/1551	4.75	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.69
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	50	0	1	1	2	17	20	4.32	823/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.32
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	50	0	5	2	4	12	18	3.88	1189/1506	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.33	3.88
5. Did av	udiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	50	0	1	2	3	10	25	4.37	365/1311	4.41	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.37
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	68	0	1	2	3	8	9	3.96	902/1490	3.96	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.96
		nts actively encourage		68	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	873/1502	4.08	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.26
		ctor encourage fair a		68	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	543/1489	4.34	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.65
		echniques successful	-	68	7	2	0	5	3	6	3.69	****/1006	3.89	3.84	4.00	3.99	****
		Laboratory															
1 Did th	ne lah ind	crease understanding	of the material	90	0	0	0	0	1	Ω	4 00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****
		ded with adequate bac		90	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	***
_	_	structor provide assi	_	90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.71	***
		nts for lab reports o		90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	***	4.69	4.15	4.59	***
		Seminar															
1. Were a	assigned t	topics relevant to th	ne announced theme	90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****
			Frequ	ency	Dig	trib	ut i oı	า									
			11040	correg	DID	C1 120	uc101										
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 17		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	в 13														
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 2	C 6		Gei	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 9	91	Non-	-major	77
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 9	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
			P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
			I O		Ot1	ner				1	.6						
			? 2														

Course Section: PSYC 200 0201 University of Maryland Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: KATENKAMP, ANGE Enrollment: 93

Questionnaires: 53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1398 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	0	7	12	32	4.42	705/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.42
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	12	40	4.77	231/1666	4.22	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.77
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	40	4.75	280/1421	4.04	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.75
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	10	0	1	6	11	23	4.37	684/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.37
				what you learned	2	6	4	1	7	10	23	4.04	747/1555	4.24	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.04
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	10	0	2	8	13	19	4.17	759/1543	4.01	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.17
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	1	0	3	10	36	4.60	367/1647	4.49	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.60
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	2	48	4.96	285/1668	4.74	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.96
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	11	2	0	1	5	20	14	4.18	779/1605	3.96	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.18
		Lectur	e															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	44	4.84	291/1514	4.59	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.84
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	3	7	42	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.75
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	9	38	4.67	386/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the	e lecture	are material presented and explained clearl ectures contribute to what you learned evisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	0	3	7	42	4.75	353/1506	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.75
5. Did au	diovisua	our understanding	2	0	1	1	3	6	40	4.63	209/1311	4.41	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.63		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	30	0	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	726/1490	3.96	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.22
				d to participate	30	0	1	1	3	8	10	4.09	982/1502	4.08	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.09
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	30	0	2	0	3	7	11	4.09	1018/1489	4.34	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.09
		echniques succe		-	30	9	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	581/1006	3.89	3.84	4.00	3.99	3.93
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	amad	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	ason				Ту				Majors	
		Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades													Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 33		Re	quire	ed f	or M	lajor	s 1	.5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	15
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	в 9														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Ger	nera:	1				9	Under-g	rad 5	3	Non-	major	38
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				2	4						
				? 1														

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: BEALL, LISA C

Enrollment: 86

Questionnaires: 46

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1399 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	14	23	4.26	901/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	17	17		1136/1666		4.13	4.19	4.29	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	13	16	9		1261/1421		4.15	4.24	4.35	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	18	19	4.13	934/1617		4.15	4.15	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	12	26	4.33	500/1555	4.24	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	8	14	17		1068/1543	4.01	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	10	27			4.49	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	30		1077/1668	4.74	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	9	15	11		918/1605		3.94	4.07	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	13	26	4.41	939/1514		4.35	4.39	4.39	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	38	4.80	788/1551	4.75	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	4	15	22	4.22	905/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	9	28	4.36	809/1506		4.23	4.26	4.33	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	7	13	23	4.24	451/1311	4.41	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	2	6	9	8	3.70	1069/1490	3.96	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	2	4	8	11		1129/1502	4.08	4.18	4.26	4.31	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	3	6	15	4.27	914/1489	4.34	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	20	6	1	2	2	9	6	3.85	625/1006		3.84	4.00	3.99	3.85
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.71	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
The second of th		-	-	-	-	_	-	0	, 2,					

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: BEALL, LISA C

Enrollment: 86
Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1399 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	20	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	45	Non-major	38
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 210 0101 University of Maryland

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING Baltimore County Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA Fall 2006

Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1400

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1 Did v	rou gain ne	General w insights,skil	_	this course	0	0	0	4	4	5	8	3 81	1352/1669	4.06	4.22	4.23	4.34	3.81
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	3	3			1164/1666		4.13	4.19		3.95
		uestions reflect			0	0	2	2	1	8			1089/1421			4.24		3.86
	_	uations reflect			0	12	0	1	1	5			1179/1617			4.15	4.24	
			_	what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7			611/1555		4.05	4.00		4.19
	_	_		what you learned	0	15	1	1	2	1			1410/1543		4.00	4.06	4.10	
		g system clearly		-	0	0	1	0	1				458/1647		4.15	4.12	4.19	4.52
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1668			4.67		
	_			ning effectiveness	0	0	5	0	4	8			1446/1605					
				3														
		Lecture	9															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lectures	s well p	prepared	0	0	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	1118/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.19
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	256/1551	4.92	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.95
3. Was 1	ecture mat	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	0	0	3	2	2	5	9	3.71	1255/1503	4.15	4.18	4.24	4.29	3.71
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	0	0	2	1	9	3	6	3.48	1327/1506	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33	3.48
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	0	1	0	3	6	6	5	3.65	854/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	3.65
		Discuss																
				what you learned	7	0	6	0	5	0			1425/1490		3.87		4.11	2.57
		_	_	l to participate	7	0	1	1	3	2			1096/1502			4.26		3.93
		_		d open discussion	7		1	2	5	2			1310/1489			4.29		3.43
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		7	10	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	3.99	***
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	рe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	16
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 7			_					_	1	, -				_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		EΙ€	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0		0.1					_	_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	ь						
				? 1														

Course Section: PSYC 210 0201 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S

Enrollment: 65 Questionnaires: 29

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1401

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	15	4.31	840/1669	4.06	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	372/1666	4.30	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	22	4.66	405/1421	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	626/1617	4.15	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	7	3	14	3.86	971/1555	4.03	4.05	4.00	3.96	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	659/1543	3.63	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	213/1647	4.64	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	1077/1668	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	604/1605	3.80	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	27	4.86	257/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	539/1551	4.92	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	482/1503	4.15	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	299/1506	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	223/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	1062/1490	3.14	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	3	3	7		950/1502		4.18	4.26	4.31	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	2	4	6		1107/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.36	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1006		3.84	4.00	3.99	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26	-			
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 215 0101 University of Maryland
Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: LEISEY, KIM
Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1402

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.32	828/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	6	16	4.36	752/1666	4.34	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	17	4.50	557/1421	4.20	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	7	13	4.14	922/1617	4.07	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	3	15	3.89	947/1555	3.79	4.05	4.00	3.96	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	10	8	3.71	1167/1543	3.83	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	6	15	4.11	992/1647	3.83	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	15	9	4.32	604/1605	4.13	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	2	22	4.61	679/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2		4.79	825/1551	4.73	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	491/1503	4.54	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	20	4.54	613/1506	4.54	4.23	4.26		4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	6	5	9	3.78	774/1311	4.03	4.08	3.85		3.78
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	604/1490	4.46	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	604/1502	4.77	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	585/1489	4.53	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	344/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	3.99	4.33
Post 10		D. J	2 1		_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				?	1						

Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C

Instructor: LEISEY, KIM

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1403 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	545/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	801/1666	4.34	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	9		1061/1421	4.20	4.15	4.19	4.35	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	٥	7		1001/1421	4.07	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	8	6		1118/1555	3.79	4.05	4.00	3.96	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	9	6	3.95	957/1543	3.83	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	7	5	6		1377/1647	3.83	4.15	4.12	4.19	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22		1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	9	3		1039/1605		3.94	4.07		3.94
J. How would jou grade one overdir oddoning crreotiveness		_	Ū	Ū	-	-		3.71	1000/1000	1.15	3.71	1.07	1.15	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	877/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1000/1551	4.73	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	556/1503	4.54	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	604/1506	4.54	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	426/1311	4.03	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	417/1490	4.46	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	4.77	4.18	4.26	4.31	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	753/1489	4.53	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	235/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	3.99	4.50
Seminar			_			_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	Τ	U		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	Ü	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.20	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_	_		
				n	0						

Course Section: PSYC 230 0201 University of Maryland Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE Baltimore County

CHEAH, CHARISSA Fall 2006

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 26

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1404

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	375/1669	4.68	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	293/1666	4.72	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	632/1421	4.44	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	10	11	4.28	533/1555	4.28	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	11	4.24	680/1543	4.24	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	292/1647	4.68	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	825/1668	4.84	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	298/1605	4.61	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	291/1514	4.84	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	131/1506	4.92	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	219/1311	4.60	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	279/1490	4.74	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	289/1489	4.89	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	209/1006	4.58	3.84	4.00	3.99	4.58

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	2	В	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	26	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Title

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 156 Questionnaires: 82

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1405 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	0	9	21	48	4.41	719/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	8	8	30	33	4.07	1054/1666	4.36	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	6	8	22	40	4.10	932/1421	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	1	1	10	22	19	4.08	987/1617	4.24	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	6	23	44	4.39	445/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	41	2	2	10		12		1115/1543	4.03	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	8	23	44	4.38	682/1647	4.47	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19		4.76	952/1668		4.77	4.67	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	1	0	15	25	24	4.09	857/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	8	26	40	4.28	1064/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	19	57		1028/1551	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	6	8	32	30		1020/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	6	5	25	38		1038/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	3	11	15	45	4.25	451/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	3	1	15	10	21	3.90	956/1490	3.84	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	1	13	11	23	4.10	975/1502		4.18	4.26	4.31	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	2	4	10	32	4.43	776/1489		4.22	4.29	4.36	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	33	28	3	2	6	6	4	3.29	862/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	79	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	79	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	***	4.06	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	79	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	80	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	80	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	80	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: Enrollment: 156 Questionnaires: 82

Baltimore County FREIBERG, KAREN Fall 2006

Page 1405 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	26	Required for Majors	20	 Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	31						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	С	10	General	20	Under-grad	82	Non-major	69
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	2						

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: RESTA, PETER

Enrollment: 67

Questionnaires: 38

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1406 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110		Genera w insights,ski		thia govern	2	0	0	2	5	3	26	4.47	633/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.47
_	_	tor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	9		4.47	,		4.22	4.23	4.29	4.47
		estions reflec			2	0	0	0	0	4								4.89
	_	ations reflect				7	0		1	7		4.38			4.15	4.15	4.24	
				hat you learned	2	0	4	3 1				4.38			4.15	4.15	3.96	4.38
	_	_		what you learned	3	6	0	3	4	9		4.10	,		4.05	4.06		4.10
		system clearl			3	0	0	2	_	10		4.10						4.10
		was class canc		nea	2	0	0	0	0	2			428/1668		4.15			4.49
				ing effectiveness	8	0	0	2	1	_			428/1608					
9. HOW WO	uia you gi	lade the overa	II teacii	ing effectiveness	0	U	U	۷	1	0	19	4.4/	423/1005	4.20	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.4/
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	408/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.78
2. Did th	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	567/1551	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.89
				plained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	11	20	4.44	653/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.44
		s contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	286/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.81
			_	ur understanding	3	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	179/1311	4.12	4.08			
		1	2															
		Discus																
				hat you learned	22	0	2	3	2	3			1154/1490		3.87		4.11	
				to participate	23	0	4	2	1	2			1370/1502		4.18	4.26	4.31	3.27
		_		open discussion	23	0	0	1	6	2			1142/1489		4.22	4.29	4.36	3.87
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		21	13	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	****
		Labora	torv															
2. Were v	ou provide			round information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****
-	-	-																
		Semina																
1. Were a	ssigned to	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****
		Field	TuT 1															
1 Did fi	old ormon			at you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
				at you learned ation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.22	5.00	****
z. Dia yo	u Clearly	understand yo	ur evalu	ation criteria	3 /	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 52			4.00	5.00	
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced s	system contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
						D			_									
				Frequ	ency	ustע	_r1b\	ut10ľ	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 23		Rec	านา่า	ed fo	or Ma			7	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		1000	1411	-u - (	) <u> </u>	בטנ ג		,	Graduat	_	•	1.100 )	<i>,</i> _	J
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 3	38	Non-	-major	32
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 0		501	-C_ u.	_				-	0			2,011		22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E] e	ectiv	ves				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
02 00.	Ü	2.55 2.50	ŭ	P 0								_	respons					,
				I 0		Oth	ıer				2.	:0					-	
				? 1		001					_	-						
				• •														

University of Maryland ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County

Title DAHLQUIST, LYNN Instructor:

Enrollment: 64 Questionnaires: 46 Fall 2006

Page 1407 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 1 1 1 8 34 4.62 448/1669 4.46 4.22 4.23 4.34 4.6 1.01 dt the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 1 0 1 0 3 44 4.27 790/1617 4.24 4.15 4.29 4.6 1.01 dt the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 0 2 1 4 29 4.60 466/1421 4.35 4.6 1.01 dt the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 1 9 0 1 5 6 14 4.27 790/1617 4.24 4.15 4.24 4.2 1.01 dt assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 2 8 11 21 4.14 676/1555 4.20 4.05 4.00 3.96 4.1 1.01 dt assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 0 3 0 3 3 3 6 4.53 446/1647 4.47 4.15 4.12 4.19 4.5 1.00 dt assigned readings system clearly explained 1 0 3 0 3 3 3 6 4.53 446/1647 4.47 4.15 4.12 4.19 4.5 1.00 dt assigned reading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 7 20 4.45 446/1647 4.47 4.15 4.12 4.19 4.5 1.00 dt assigned the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 1 0 0 1 7 20 4.45 446/1647 4.47 4.15 4.12 4.19 4.5 1.00 dt assigned the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 1 0 0 1 7 20 4.45 446/1647 4.47 4.15 4.12 4.19 4.5 1.00 dt binstructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 40 4.89 223/1514 4.53 4.35 4.39 4.39 4.8 1.01 dt binstructor seem interrested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 40 4.89 223/1514 4.53 4.35 4.39 4.39 4.8 1.01 dt binstructor seem interrested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 1 4 3 40 4.89 223/1514 4.53 4.35 4.39 4.39 4.8 1.01 dt binstructor seem interrested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 38 4.80 231/1503 4.04 1.18 4.24 4.29 4.8 1.01 dt binstructor seem interrested applicated calcarly 2 0 0 1 1 4 38 4.80 231/1503 4.04 1.18 4.24 4.29 4.8 1.01 dt binstructor seem interrested applicated calcarly 2 0 0 1 1 4 38 4.80 231/1503 4.04 1.18 4.24 4.29 4.8 1.01 dt binstructor accordinate to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
1. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	General														
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	8	34	4.62	448/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.6
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1 19 0 1 5 6 14 4.27 790/1617 4.24 4.15 4.15 4.24 1.2	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	10	33	4.62	412/1666	4.36	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.6
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   1   2   1   2   8   11   21   4.14   676/1555   4.20   4.05   4.00   3.96   4.11   4.10   24.14   4.07   24.1514   4.03   4.00   4.06   4.10   4.2   4.24   4.06   4.06   4.00   4.06   4.10   4.2   4.24   4.06   4.06   4.05   4.05   4.06   4.05   4.05   4.06   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05   4.05	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	14	29	4.60	466/1421	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.35	4.6
1	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0		5	6	14	4.27	790/1617	4.24	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.2
Was the grading system clearly explained   1 0 3 0 3 3 3 3 6 4.53 446/1647 4.47 4.15 4.12 4.19 4.5															
How many times was class cancelled				-			_								
Lecture  Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  Did the instructor seminare converged fair and open discussion  Did the instructor's encouraged to participate  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  Were you provided with adequate background information  Were sassigned topics relevant to the announced theme  Were sassigned topics relevant to the announced theme  Were sassigned topics relevant to the announced theme  Field Work  Did diself-paced system contribute to what you learned  Self Paced  Did salf-paced system contribute to what you learned  Self Paced  Did salf-paced system contribute to what you learned  Self Paced  Did salf-paced system contribute to what you learned  Self Paced  Discussion  Tequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution			-	-	-	-									
Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 1 3 40 4.89 223/1514 4.53 4.25 4.39 4.39 4.8   Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 3 41 4.38 358/1551 4.82 4.66 4.66 4.67 4.72 4.9   Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 1 4 38 4.00 231/1503 4.40 4.18 4.24 4.29 4.8   Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 7 36 4.80 291/1503 4.40 4.18 4.24 4.29 4.8   Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2 0 1 6 10 24 4.39 341/1311 4.12 4.08 3.85 3.96 4.3   Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 567/1490 3.84 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.3   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 2 5 16 4.61 540/1502 3.86 4.18 4.26 4.31 4.6   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 4 19 4.83 358/1489 4.25 4.22 4.29 4.36 4.8   Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***  Laboratory  Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 23 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***  Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 ***  Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 3.63 4.22 4.50 ***  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.06 4.02 4.63 ***  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.06 4.00 ****  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.22 4.20 ****  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.33 5.00 ****  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 40 4.89 223/1514 4.53 4.35 4.39 4.39 4.8 2.0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	U	Τ	U	U	17	20	4.45	448/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.4
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 3 41 4.93 358/1551 4.82 4.66 4.72 4.9   1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 1 4 38 4.80 231/1503 4.40 4.18 4.24 4.29 4.8   1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 7 3 6 4.80 299/1506 4.50 4.23 4.26 4.33 4.8   1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2 0 1 6 10 24 4.39 341/1311 4.12 4.08 3.85 3.86 4.3   1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 567/1490 3.84 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.3   1. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 567/1490 3.84 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.3   1. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 567/1490 3.84 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.3   1. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 2 1 10 4.01 540/1502 3.86 4.18 4.26 4.31 4.6   1. Were special techniques successful 23 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***   2. Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 12 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***   2. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***   2. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***   2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Lecture														
Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly   2 0 0 0 1 1 4 438 4.80 231/1503 4.40 4.18 4.24 4.29 4.8	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						_	40		223/1514		4.35	4.39	4.39	4.8
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   2 0 0 0 0 1 7 7 86 4.80 299/1506 4.50 4.23 4.26 4.33 4.8	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject														
Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 567/1490 3.84 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.3 4.6 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10															
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 567/1490 3.84 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.3   . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 2 5 16 4.61 540/1502 3.86 4.18 4.26 4.31 4.6   . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 4 19 4.83 358/1489 4.25 4.22 4.29 4.36 4.8   . Were special techniques successful 23 6 3 0 4 5 5 3.53 753/1006 3.41 3.84 4.00 3.99 3.5    Laboratory . Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***   Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 12 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***   . Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 ***   . Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 3.63 4.22 4.50 ***   . Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Field Work . Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.22 4.20 ***   . Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.22 4.20 ***   . Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.33 5.00 ***   . Was the instructor available for consultation 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.33 5.00 ***   . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.33 5.00 ***   . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.34 4.67 ***   . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.34 4.67 ***   . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.34 4.67 ***   . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.34 4.67 ***   . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/				-											
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 2 10 11 4.39 567/1490 3.84 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.3   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 2 5 16 4.61 540/1502 3.86 4.18 4.26 4.31 4.6   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 4 19 4.83 358/1489 4.25 4.22 4.29 4.36 4.8   Were special techniques successful 23 6 3 0 4 5 5 3.53 753/1006 3.41 3.84 4.00 3.99 3.5    Laboratory  Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***   Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***   Ass the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 ***   Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Field Work  Did government of the instructor available for consultation 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Seminar  Seminar  Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 10 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.49 5.00 ***    Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.33 5.00 ***    Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.34 4.67 ***    Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.34 4.67 ***    Frequency Distribution	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	6	10	24	4.39	341/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	4.3
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 0 2 5 16 4.61 540/1502 3.86 4.18 4.26 4.31 4.6   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 4 19 4.83 358/1489 4.25 4.22 4.29 4.36 4.8   4. Were special techniques successful 23 6 3 0 4 5 5 3.53 753/1006 3.41 3.84 4.00 3.99 3.5    Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***    Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***   3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 ***   4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Field Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Did give experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***    Did give learly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 5.00 ***   3. Was the instructor available for consultation 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 5.00 ***   3. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.22 4.20 ***   3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.34 4.67 ***   3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.34 4.67 ***   3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.31 5.00 ***   3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.31 5.00 ***   3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.25 5.00 ***   4. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.55 5.00 ****   4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Discussion														
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 0 4 19 4.83 358/1489 4.25 4.22 4.29 4.36 4.8 Were special techniques successful 23 6 3 0 4 5 5 3.53 753/1006 3.41 3.84 4.00 3.99 3.8    Laboratory   Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***  Seminar   Seminar   Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***  Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 ***  Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 3.63 4.22 4.50 ***  Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 5.00 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation attended 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.39 5.00 ***  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.39 5.00 ***  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 46 **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 ***** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** 4.35 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	l. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	567/1490	3.84	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.3
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***  Seminar  . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 ***  Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 3.63 4.22 4.50 ***  Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.22 4.20 ***  Was the instructor available for consultation 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.39 5.00 ***  Belf Paced  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 ***  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	540/1502	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.6
Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.50 4.19 4.36 ***  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 112 **** 4.06 4.38 4.59 ***  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 ***  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 *** 3.63 4.22 4.50 ***  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 ***  Did sonferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.33 5.00 ***  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.35 5.00 ***  3. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 41 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	4	19	4.83	358/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.8
Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	3	0	4	5	5	3.53	753/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	3.5
Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	Laboratory														
### Self Paced    New Pack Standard Contribute to what you learned   45   0   0   0   1   0   0   3.00   ****   112   ****   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.06   4.38   4.59   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.50   ***   4.	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 3.56 4.36 4.60 *** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 3.63 4.22 4.50 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 ***  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 ***  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 ***  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  B. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 42 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	Seminar														
8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 3.63 4.22 4.50 ***  8. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 ***  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 ***  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 45 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 ***  6. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 ***  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	**1
Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 4.06 4.20 4.63 ***  Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 ***  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 ***  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.60	***
Field Work  Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 ***  B. Was the instructor available for consultation 45 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 ***  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 ***  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45						0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.50	
Did field experience contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** **** 4.22 4.20 ***  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 5.00 ***  Was the instructor available for consultation 45 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 39 **** **** 4.39 5.00 ***  Did conferences help you carry out field activities 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 5.00 ***  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.63	* * *
Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 52 *** *** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 55 *** *** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 42 *** *** 4.31 5.00 ***  Belf Paced  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 42 *** *** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 46 *** *** 4.45 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution	Field Work														
Self Paced  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 30 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ***/ 42 **** *** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	**:
Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.33 5.00 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	**
Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	***
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	5.00	* * *
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 45 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.34 4.67 ***  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ***  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.31 5.00 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 *** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution		45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	**
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 44 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.45 5.00 ***  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal							0		,	****	****			***
E. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 45 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 5.00 ***  Frequency Distribution	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful							0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****			***
	4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful				0		0	0		****/ 33	****	****			***
	Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	es Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A 18	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	в 17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General	8	Under-grad	46	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means	ther	e are not enough	a

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 21 ? 1

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE

Enrollment: 77
Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1408 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	-	ncie 3	s A	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean
		NA						Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	10	13	34	4.34	816/1669	4.46	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	12	17	25		1076/1666	4.36	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.03
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	2	4	16	18	18		1121/1421	4.35	4.15	4.24	4.35	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	44	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	****/1617	4.24	4.15	4.15	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	1	10	13	27	4.17	644/1555	4.20	4.05	4.00	3.96	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	50	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1543	4.03	4.00	4.06	4.10	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	17	37	4.47	532/1647	4.47	4.15	4.12	4.19	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	52	5		1487/1668	4.69	4.77	4.67	4.59	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	14	20	16	4.04	891/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.15	4.04
7 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	9	22	25	4.17	1136/1514	4.53	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	8	49	4.80	806/1551	4.82	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	10	18	30	4.29	852/1503	4.40	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	6	11	36	4.33	848/1506	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.33	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	4	9	12	7	8	3.15	1088/1311	4.12	4.08	3.85	3.96	3.15
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	4	6	5	10	13	3.58	1128/1490	3.84	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	5	6	13	10	3.46	1315/1502	3.86	4.18	4.26	4.31	3.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	4	0	8	12	15	3.87	1137/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.36	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	22	35	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1006	3.41	3.84	4.00	3.99	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.36	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.59	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	2	1	0	0	0		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
Self Paced		_	_	_										
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58 58	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.07	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
Frequ	encv	. Diet	rib	ıt i o	n									
rredu	сттсу	ומדת	10		-1									

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	А	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	28						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	12	General	9	Under-grad	61	Non-major	39
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	30				

? 3

Title ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 149
Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1409 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		ot 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	Ο	3	6	18	28	26	3 84	1332/1669	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	4	7	23	20	27		1348/1666	4.03	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	4	8	17	21	31		1106/1421		4.15	4.24	4.25	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	57	0	0	9		7		1154/1617	4.08	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	3	5	10	25	35		728/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	64	1	1	3	3	8		****/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	10	17	53	4.49	498/1647	3.94	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	33	46	4.58	1138/1668	4.72	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	6	13	28	19	3.87	1124/1605	4.09	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	3	12	18	45	4.35	1013/1514	4.47	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	6	70	4.81	760/1551	4.85	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	10	10	28	28	3.90	1172/1503	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	6	12	18	38	3.99	1090/1506	4.34	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	4	5	9	21	38	4.09	542/1311	3.87	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	5	5	12	13	17	3 62	1112/1490	4.12	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	3	5	14	30	4.37	790/1502	4.58	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	3	3	13	33	4.46	,	4.65	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	34	8	7	3	12	10	12	3.39	,		3.84	4.00	4.10	3.39
		-	-	_					,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	83	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	17	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	40						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	17	C	17	General	22	Under-grad	85	Non-major	75
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	22	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	43				
				2	0						

ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY

Title Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 33 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1410 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	2	3	8	17	4.33	816/1669	4.09	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	8	17	4.33	777/1666	4.03	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	4	8	16	4.23	831/1421	4.03	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	801/1617	4.08	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	4	5	18	4.27	550/1555	4.17	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	14	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	807/1543	4.13	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	4	4	8	3	10	3.38	1454/1647	3.94	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	788/1668	4.72	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	12	13	4.31	617/1605	4.09	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.31
Lecture					_				500/45-		4 05	4 05		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	703/1514	4.47	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	539/1551	4.85	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	482/1503		4.18	4.24	4.28	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	433/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	2	5	7	7	3.65	854/1311	3.87	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	2.2	4.63	364/1490	4.12	3.87	4.05	1 11	4.63
	3		0	0	2 0	4 6	23 24	4.80	,				4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0				-			336/1502	4.58	4.18	4.26	4.28	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0 2	0	0 4	5 2	25	4.83	348/1489		4.22	4.29		4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	18	2	U	4	2	4	3.50	759/1006	3.44	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
må of distance														
Field Work	20	0	0	^	0	1	0	4 00	**** LO		****	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	00	****/ 52			4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.39	3.82	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31 31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
1. Has the recastion, tatoring by process neighbor	31	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	, 55			1.23	3.00	
_		- B.J	2 1											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	33	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 9 .

Course Section: PSYC 308 0101 University of Maryland Title CHILD MALTREATMENT

Baltimore County

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 50

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1411

Student C	ourse	Eval	uatic	on (	Duest	ionnai	re
-----------	-------	------	-------	------	-------	--------	----

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5		tructor Rank	Course	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	10	0	2	2	_	1 2	1.0	4 02	1159/1669	4.03	4.22	4 02	4 20	4 02
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	12 12	0	0	∠ 5	5 4	13 13	16 16		1065/1666	4.03	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.03 4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	4	4	4	12	14		1141/1421	3.74	4.15	4.19	4.25	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	1	0	4	8	11	14		1112/1617	3.74	4.15	4.15	4.23	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	4	6	7	16		1141/1555	3.66	4.15	4.15	4.03	3.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	11	2	5	1	8			1123/1543	3.78	4.00		4.14	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	2	4	6	9	17		1137/1647	3.70	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	6	32		825/1668	4.84	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	2	3	8	7			1210/1605	3.75	3.94	4.07		3.75
T a shows														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	4	8	26	4.58	715/1514	4.58	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	2	1	5			1042/1551	4.66	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	4	4	5	25	4.34	788/1503	4.34	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	2	5	4	23		1047/1506	4.05	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	2	2	2	8			405/1311				3.97	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	U	2	4	2	0	24	4.32	405/1311	4.32	4.00	3.03	3.91	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	2	2	4	12	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	531/1502	4.62	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	***
		- 54-4												
Frequ	lency	DISC	LIDU	ıcıor	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	son	s 			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	23
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 19														
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 11 C 4		Ger	neral	l			1	7	Under-g	rad 5	50	Non-	major	27
84-150 23 3.00-3.49 10 D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0		El€	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
P 0									response	es to k	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0		Oth	ıer				1	4						
? 1														

Baltimore County

Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME Instructor: ALLEN, JOHN

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 33 University of Maryland Page 1412 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Overtions							Fr	equei	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	10	0	4	2	6	5	6	3.30	1550/1669	3.30	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.30
_	_	ctor make clear			10	0	3	4	3	9	4	3.30	1534/1666	3.30	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.30
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	10	0	3	3	6	9	2	3.17	1329/1421	3.17	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.17
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	10	21	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1617	****	4.15	4.15	4.22	***
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	1	1	6	6	9	3.91	922/1555	3.91	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.91
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	10	20	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1543	****	4.00	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	10	1	3	3	2	10	4	3.41	1440/1647	3.41	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.41
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		10	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1487/1668	4.09	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.09
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	12	1	4	1	5	9	1	3.10	1496/1605	3.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.10
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	10	0	1	1	5	5	11	4.04	1188/1514	4.04	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.04
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	1176/1551	4.52	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.52
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear						3	2	3	7	8	3.65	1281/1503	3.65	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.65
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						5	1	4	2	11	3.57	1307/1506	3.57	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.57
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					22	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.97	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	17	0	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1311/1490	3.13	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.13
				ed to participate	17	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1135/1502	3.88	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.88
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	883/1489	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.31
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful	_	16	5	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	902/1006	3.17	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.17
				Freq	uency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
O	Developed Consider				D.a.		_			m				Ma =				
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								ке:	ason	.s 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	14
	28-55 3 1.00-1.99 1 B 10																	
	56-83 4 2.00-2.99 2 C 2						nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 3	13	Non-	major	19

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				2	1						

Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE

Instructor: FOX, MARY H

Enrollment:

61 Questionnaires: 33

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1413 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

9

		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain n		s from this course	3	0	1	2	5	13	9	3.90	1288/1669	3.90	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.90
		ctor make clear th		3	0	0	6	9	6	9		1432/1666			4.19	4.20	3.60
			the expected goals	3	2	0	2	6	8	12		943/1421				4.25	4.07
	_	uations reflect th		3	0	0	2	2	9	17		684/1617		4.15		4.22	4.37
			e to what you learned	4	0		2	5	12			947/1555			4.00	4.03	
	-	_	ute to what you learne		0	0	2	3	14	11		795/1543	4.13				4.13
		g system clearly		3	0		8	4	4			1495/1647				4.14	
		was class cancel		3	0		0	0	4	26		788/1668		4.77		4.68	
			teaching effectivenes		0		1	5	13			1172/1605					
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	3	0	1	3	10	7	9	3.67	1352/1514	3.67	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.67
			ted in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	7	22		986/1551			4.66	4.70	4.70
			and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	8	8			1245/1503				4.28	
		es contribute to		3	0		2	8	8			1194/1506				4.30	
			nce your understanding		4		4	9	3			1100/1311					
J. 214 44					-	-	-		3	Ü	3.11	1100, 1011	0.11	1.00	3.03	3.57	3.11
1. Did al	ass disc	Discussions contribute	on e to what you learned	19	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1016/1490	3.79	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.79
			uraged to participate	19	0		0	2	3	9		632/1502			4.26	4.28	4.50
					0		0	2	1	10	4.62				4.29	4.35	
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi Were special techniques successful						0	3	1			711/1006		3.84		4.10	
		207.7															
1 Did th	ne lah in	Laborato: crease understand	ing of the material	24	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	180/ 226	3.67	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.67
			background informatio		0		2	0	3	3		202/ 233	3.56			4.13	3.56
_	_	_	ble for lab activities		2		0	2	2	2		****/ 225	****	4.72		4.45	****
		structor provide		25	1		0	0	3	_		****/ 223	****			4.27	****
			ts clearly specified	25	1		0	1	3			****/ 206		4.69		4.08	****
	1	_	1 11 11									,					
3 Did re	search n	Seminar	e to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4 22	4.47	****
J. 214 10	bearon p	-	-	32	ŭ	Ū	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	2.00	, , , , 2		3.03			
2 Did vo	nı clearl	Field Wo:	rk evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
z. Dia 70	orcari	y anacistana your				_		_	Ū	J	1.00	, 32			1.00	3.33	
			Fre	quency	y Di	strik	outio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grade	s			Re	easor	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27		R	 equi:	red f	or M	 Major	:	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	22			
28-55																	
56-83							al			1	.2	Under-g	rad :	33	Non-	-major	11
84-150																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						lecti	ives				0	#### - 1	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	jh
										respons	es to 1	oe sigr	nificar	nt			
			- 0		_	-1					0	-					

Other

I

0

Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 12

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1414 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
----------------------------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	•					_			0-0-1					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	269/1669		4.22	4.23	4.28	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	243/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	180/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	4.75
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	150/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6		1190/1668		4.77	4.67	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	268/1605	4.64	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1503	4.91	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	249/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	489/1311		4.08	3.85	3.97	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	389/1490		3.87	4.05	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	632/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	378/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	217/1006	4.56	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.56
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	***	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	Λ	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	00	****/ 42	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33	****		4.25	3.00	****
4. was the reeuback/tutoring by proctors herpful	ΤŢ	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	/ 33			4.25	3.00	
_		<u>.</u>												

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title

Instructor: WARREN, KIMBERL

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1415 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	840/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	868/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	847/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	684/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	584/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	598/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	713/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	731/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	9	4	2	3.53	1343/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	993/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	10		1254/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	6	5		1250/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	3	10		1025/1506		4.23	4.24	4.20	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	712/1311	4.43	4.23	3.85		3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	۷	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	/12/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	849/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1172/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	3	2	2	7	3.56	1253/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	947/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	2.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	136/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	146/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	2	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	187/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	134/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 206		4.69	4.15	4.08	4.67
Seminar	1.0		0	0	-	-	-	4 00	***** / 110	4 1 1	1 06	4 20	4 50	als als als als
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92		3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 105	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.23	4.13	***
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	± /	U	J	J	J	_	_	1.50	/ 29			1.51	1.13	

Course Section: PSYC 331 0101
Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Instructor: WARREN, KIMBERL

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1415 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 84 Questionnaires: 39

Title

## Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1416 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	12	24	4.62	448/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	110/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	242/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	161/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	11	15	4.15	665/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	371/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	213/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	151/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	113/1514		4.35	4.39	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	154/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	76/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	188/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	232/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.58
Discussion			_	_					500/5400					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	10	16	4.26	692/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	450/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10 9	0 8	0 2	0	0 3	6 3	23 14	4.79	389/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	U	3	3	14	4.23	393/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	180/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	66/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	81/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	98/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar							_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 92	4.00	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35 35	1	0	0	0	1	1 2		****/ 105 ****/ 98	4.17 4.50	4.06	4.20 3.95	4.45 4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	35	1	U	U	U	1	2	4.07	/ 90	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	~ * * *

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1416 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 84 Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

331 0201 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1417

TIID CT accor.		( 1115 C1 .
Enrollment:	84	

Ouestionnaires: 39

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Questions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 0 1 12 24 4.62 448/1669 4.60 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.62 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 2 0 0 4 34 4.89 110/1666 4.77 4.13 4.19 4.20 4.89 0 1 6 30 4.78 242/1421 4.68 4.15 4.24 4.25 4.78 0 1 5 29 4.80 161/1617 4.67 4.15 4.15 4.22 4.80 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 3 0 2 6 11 15 4.15 665/1555 4.05 4.05 4.00 4.03 4.15 0 2 12 20 4.53 371/1543 4.52 4.00 4.06 4.14 4.53 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 2 5 30 4.76 213/1647 4.57 4.15 4.12 4.14 4.76 3 0 0 0 0 0 36 5.00 1/1668 4.99 4.77 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 3 0 0 5 8 6 4.05 884/1605 4.10 3.94 4.07 4.09 4.36 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 20 0 0 Ω Ω 6 13 4.68 553/1514 4.50 4.35 4.39 4.46 4.68 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 22 0 0 0 5 12 4.71 973/1551 4.60 4.66 4.66 4.70 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 21 0 0 0 2 2 14 4.67 386/1503 4.39 4.18 4.24 4.28 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 1 2 4 8 4.06 1042/1506 4.36 4.23 4.26 4.30 4.43 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 24 8 0 0 5 2 4.29 \*\*\*\*/1311 4.43 4.08 3.85 3.97 4.58 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 Ω 3 10 16 4.26 692/1490 4.18 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.26 1 7 23 4.71 450/1502 4.49 4.18 4.26 4.28 4.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 6 23 4.79 389/1489 4.44 4.22 4.29 4.35 4.79 4. Were special techniques successful 9 8 0 3 3 14 4.23 393/1006 3.91 3.84 4.00 4.10 4.23 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24 0 4 6 3.67 180/ 226 4.10 4.08 4.20 4.17 3.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 66/ 233 4.59 4.50 4.19 4.13 4.67 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 2 0 0 12 4.77 81/ 225 4.67 4.72 4.50 4.45 4.77 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 24 0 1 0 0 2 12 4.60 98/ 223 4.57 4.51 4.35 4.27 4.60 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24 8 0 7 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 206 4.72 4.69 4.15 4.08 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 35 1 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 112 4.17 4.06 4.38 4.53 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 35 1 0 1 2 4.67 \*\*\*\*/ 97 4.00 3.56 4.36 4.12 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 35 2 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 92 4.00 3.63 4.22 4.47 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 35 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 105 4.17 4.06 4.20 4.45 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 35 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 \*\*\*\*/ 98 4.50 3.39 3.95 4.15 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 37 0 1 0 0 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 58 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.29 \*\*\*\* 37 0 1 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 38 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.39 3.82 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 38 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 40 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.97 3.34 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.33 3.49 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.03 \*\*\*\* 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 38 0 0 38 0 0 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 42 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.31 4.13 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 1 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 37 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 46 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.13 \*\*\*\*

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 38 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 33 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.25 3.00 \*\*\*\*

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 38 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 29 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.13 \*\*\*\* Course Section: PSYC 331 0201 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 84
Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1417 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	С	8	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

84

3C1011: PSIC 331 0201

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 39

(Instr. C)

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1418

Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_			Sect Mean
Conomal														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	12	24	4.62	448/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	110/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	242/1421		4.15	4.24	4.25	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	161/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	11	15	4.15	665/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	371/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	30	4.76	213/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1668		4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	713/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	955/1514		4.35	4.39	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	880/1551		4.66	4.66	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	1	1	1		4.63	438/1503		4.18	4.24	4.28	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	838/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	7	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	10	16	4.26	692/1490		3.87	4.05	4.11	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	450/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	389/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	2	0	3	3	14	4.23	393/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	180/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	66/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	2	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	81/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	98/ 223		4.51	4.35	4.27	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112		4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97		3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92		3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105		4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	1	0		,	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Enrollment: 84 Questionnaires: 39 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1418 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Instructor: Fall 2006 PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1419 JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires. 37	u_ D C		uu 0 1	J11 Q	ucb 0.			•						
Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	489/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	173/1666		4.13	4.23	4.20	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74			4.15		4.25	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	8	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	300/1617		4.15		4.22	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	7	0	3	5	5	7		1021/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	8	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	325/1543		4.00			4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647		4.15		4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668		4.77		4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	525/1605		3.94	4.07		3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	76/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.3
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	254/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.1
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	2	22	4.67	471/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	142/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.75
Discussion						_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	820/1490		3.87	4.05	4.11	4.0
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	3		4.50	632/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	846/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	4.3
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory	0.4	0	0	1	0	4	1.0	4 52	72/006	4 10	4 00	4 00	4 1 17	4 51
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	73/ 226		4.08	4.20	4.17	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	37/ 233		4.50	4.19	4.13	4.8
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	5	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	54/ 225			4.50		4.90
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	24 24	0 4	0 0	0	1 0	3 0	11 11	4.67 5.00	85/ 223 1/ 206		4.51 4.69	4.35 4.15	4.27 4.08	4.67 5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50			****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50			****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40		****	3.97	3.34	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30		****	4.33	3.49	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	:	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	21
28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 8														
56-83 7 2.00-2.99 5 C 4		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 3	9	Non-	-major	18
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 5 D 1														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 1		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 23 ? 1

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1420

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 12 0 9 17 4.59 489/1669 4.60 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.59 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 12 0 2 1 24 4.81 173/1666 4.77 4.13 4.19 4.20 4.81 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 12 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 12 8 0 0 2 3 22 4.74 293/1421 4.68 4.15 4.24 4.25 4.74 0 2 2 15 4.68 300/1617 4.67 4.15 4.15 4.22 4.68 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12 7 0 3 5 5 7 3.80 1021/1555 4.05 4.05 4.00 4.03 3.80 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 12 8 0 1 3 14 4.58 325/1543 4.52 4.00 4.06 4.14 4.58 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 13 0 0 4 5 17 4.50 481/1647 4.57 4.15 4.12 4.14 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 14 0 0 0 0 0 25 5.00 1/1668 4.99 4.77 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 26 0 1 4 6 2 3.69 1255/1605 4.10 3.94 4.07 4.09 3.94 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 26 0 1 Ω 2 1 9 4.31 1052/1514 4.50 4.35 4.39 4.46 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 29 0 1 0 2 6 4.10 1391/1551 4.60 4.66 4.66 4.70 4.37 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 3 6 4.09 1020/1503 4.39 4.18 4.24 4.28 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 28 0 1 0 4 6 4.27 892/1506 4.36 4.23 4.26 4.30 4.25 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 32 1 1 0 1 0 4 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1311 4.43 4.08 3.85 3.97 4.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25 0 9 4.07 820/1490 4.18 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.07 25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate Ω 0 3 10 4.50 632/1502 4.49 4.18 4.26 4.28 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 1 0 1 3 9 4.36 846/1489 4.44 4.22 4.29 4.35 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 25 7 1 0 5 4.14 \*\*\*\*/1006 3.91 3.84 4.00 4.10 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 10 4.53 73/ 226 4.10 4.08 4.20 4.17 4.53 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 Ω Ω 0 2 13 4.87 37/ 233 4.59 4.50 4.19 4.13 4.87 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 5 54/ 225 4.67 4.72 4.50 4.45 4.90 0 1 9 4.90 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 24 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 85/ 223 4.57 4.51 4.35 4.27 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24 4 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/ 206 4.72 4.69 4.15 4.08 5.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 58 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.29 \*\*\*\* 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 37 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.39 3.82 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 37 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 37 0 0 40 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.97 3.34 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 37 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.33 3.49 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37 0 0 0 0 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.03 \*\*\*\* 1 4.33 \*\*\*\*/ 42 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.31 4.13 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 36 0 0 0 0 2 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 37 0 0 0 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 46 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.13 \*\*\*\* 0 1 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 37 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 33 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.25 3.00 \*\*\*\* 0 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 29 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.13 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	s there	are not enough	ı.

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 23 ? 1

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1421 JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Fall 2006 Instructor: (Instr. C) Enrollment: 67

Ouestionnaires:	39	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			T7-00			-		Tna	twiator.	Course	Dont	TIMDO	T orrol	Coat
Ouestions	MD	NA	1	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Mean		Level	Sect Mean
Quescions		INA								Mean			Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	489/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	173/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	293/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	8	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	300/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	7	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1021/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	8	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	325/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	1	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1210/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.94
Lecture	0.5	0	•	0	-		_	4 00	1100/1514	4 50	4 25	4 20	4 46	4 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	0	1	4	7		1199/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	2	0	0	2	6		1404/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	2	1	0	4	4		1289/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	0	0	5			1219/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	2	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	820/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	632/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	846/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	25	7	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
- 1														
Laboratory	0.4	0	^	1	^	4	1.0	4 52	72/006	4 10	4 00	4 00	4 1 7	4 52
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	73/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	37/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	4.87
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	5	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	54/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	85/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	,	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
3. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	31	U	J	J	J	U	۷	5.00	/ 29			7.37	4.13	
Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 23 ? 1

Course Section: PSYC 331 0301 University of Maryland
Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 67
Ouestionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1422

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 12 0 9 17 4.59 489/1669 4.60 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.59 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 12 0 0 2 1 24 4.81 173/1666 4.77 4.13 4.19 4.20 4.81 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 12 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 12 8 0 0 2 3 22 4.74 293/1421 4.68 4.15 4.24 4.25 4.74 0 2 2 15 4.68 300/1617 4.67 4.15 4.15 4.22 4.68 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 12 7 0 3 5 5 7 3.80 1021/1555 4.05 4.05 4.00 4.03 3.80 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 12 8 0 1 3 14 4.58 325/1543 4.52 4.00 4.06 4.14 4.58 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 13 0 0 4 5 17 4.50 481/1647 4.57 4.15 4.12 4.14 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 14 0 0 0 0 0 25 5.00 1/1668 4.99 4.77 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 27 3 0 3 6 0 3.67 \*\*\*\*/1605 4.10 3.94 4.07 4.09 3.94 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 29 0 1 Ω 1 4 4 4.00 1199/1514 4.50 4.35 4.39 4.46 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 30 0 1 0 1 4 3 3.89 \*\*\*\*/1551 4.60 4.66 4.66 4.70 4.37 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 31 0 1 1 3 3 3.88 \*\*\*\*/1503 4.39 4.18 4.24 4.28 4.17 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 4 3 3.89 \*\*\*\*/1506 4.36 4.23 4.26 4.30 4.25 30 0 1 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 33 2 1 0 1 0 2 3.50 \*\*\*\*/1311 4.43 4.08 3.85 3.97 4.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25 9 4.07 820/1490 4.18 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.07 25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate Ω 0 3 10 4.50 632/1502 4.49 4.18 4.26 4.28 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 1 0 1 3 9 4.36 846/1489 4.44 4.22 4.29 4.35 4.36 4. Were special techniques successful 25 7 1 0 5 4.14 \*\*\*\*/1006 3.91 3.84 4.00 4.10 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 10 4.53 73/ 226 4.10 4.08 4.20 4.17 4.53 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 Ω Ω 0 2 13 4.87 37/ 233 4.59 4.50 4.19 4.13 4.87 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 5 54/ 225 4.67 4.72 4.50 4.45 4.90 0 1 9 4.90 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 24 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 85/ 223 4.57 4.51 4.35 4.27 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24 4 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/ 206 4.72 4.69 4.15 4.08 5.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 58 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.29 \*\*\*\* 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 37 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.39 3.82 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 37 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 37 0 0 40 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.97 3.34 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 37 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.33 3.49 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 37 0 0 0 0 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.03 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 1 4.33 \*\*\*\*/ 42 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.31 4.13 \*\*\*\* 36 0 0 0 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 37 0 0 0 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 46 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.13 \*\*\*\* 1 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 37 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 33 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.25 3.00 \*\*\*\* 0 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 37 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 29 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.13 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	.1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	39	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 23 ? 1

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title

Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 22

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1423 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	207/1669	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	293/1666	4.77	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	429/1421	4.68	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	445/1617	4.67	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	301/1555	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	427/1543	4.52	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	0	5	13	4.45	583/1647	4.57	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.99	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	538/1605	4.10	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	360/1514	4.50	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	650/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	386/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	340/1506	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	2	16	4.52	255/1311	4.43	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	433/1490	4.18	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	729/1502	4.49	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	622/1489	4.44	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	479/1006	3.91	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	2	0	4	3	5	3.64	182/ 226	4.10	4.08	4.20	4.17	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	178/ 233	4.59	4.50	4.19	4.13	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	174/ 225	4.67	4.72	4.50	4.45	4.13
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	138/ 223	4.57	4.51	4.35	4.27	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	2	2	2	7	3.67	163/ 206	4.72	4.69	4.15	4.08	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	80/ 112	4.17	4.06	4.38	4.53	4.17
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	68/ 97	4.00	3.56	4.36	4.12	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	63/ 92	4.00	3.63	4.22	4.47	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	64/ 105	4.17	4.06	4.20	4.45	4.17
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	3.39	3.95	4.15	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1423 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 27

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1424 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	9	11	4		1414/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	9		1094/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	6	10		1095/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	750/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	4	6	6		1364/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	,	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	6	13		1043/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6	17		1151/1668		4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	8	11	3	3.63	1299/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	15	6	4 00	1199/1514	3 59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	16		1168/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	5	13	3		1330/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	5	6	10		1265/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	5	4	10	5		929/1311			3.85	3.97	
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	_	_		J	7	10	J	3.32	<i>JZJ/</i> 1311	3.17	1.00	3.03	3.91	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	8	3	2	2.94	1361/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	938/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	865/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	, -	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
J. Were requirements for rap reports orearry specifica	23	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	J	-	3.00	, 200		1.05	1.15	1.00	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
0.15														
Self Paced	20	^	0	^	^	^	-1	F 00	****/ 55	444	4444	1 24	4 02	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 55	*****	~ ~ × ×	4.34	4.03	* * * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	***

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 27

AS (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1424 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. B)

Page 1425 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	58				
Questionnaires:	27	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	**************************************														
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	9	11	4	3.65	1414/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.65
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	1094/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	6	10	3.85	1095/1421		4.15	4.24	4.25	3.85
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	12		750/1617		4.15	4.15		4.31
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	4	6			1364/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	3.24
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	771/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15
	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	6	13		1043/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.00
	How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6			1151/1668		4.77	4.67		4.56
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	4	6	1			1542/1605					3.14
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1413/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.69
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	3	1	4	3	3.64	1481/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.98
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	3	2	3	3	0	2.55	1469/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.06
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1403/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.40
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	0	2	2	1			****/1311				3.97	
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1														
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	8	3	2	2.94	1361/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.94
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	938/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.17
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	4	10	4.06	1025/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.06
4.	Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	865/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.27
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
	Field Work		_	_	_										
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2		,	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
	0.16 7. 1														
1	Self Paced	0.0	0	0	0	0	^	-1	F 00	++++/	++++	++	1 21	4 02	****
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55 ****/ 46	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, 10	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29		0 0 0 0	4.34	4.13	

Fall 2006

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 27 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1425 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	ned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons		Туре	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 46 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.13 \*\*\*\*

26 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* / 29 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.13 \*\*\*\*

Page 1426 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Ouestionnaires: 27

Enrollment:

# Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 2 9 11 4 3.65 1414/1669 3.37 4.22 4.23 4.28 3.65 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 5 10 9 4.00 1094/1666 3.50 4.13 4.19 4.20 4.00 4 6 6 10 3.85 1095/1421 3.37 4.15 4.24 4.25 3.85 0 4 10 12 4.31 750/1617 3.93 4.15 4.15 4.22 4.31 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 3 6 4 6 6 3.24 1364/1555 2.95 4.05 4.00 4.03 3.24 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 6 10 10 4.15 771/1543 3.84 4.00 4.06 4.14 4.15 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 2 2 3 6 13 4.00 1043/1647 3.69 4.15 4.12 4.14 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 1 1 6 17 4.56 1151/1668 4.68 4.77 4.67 4.68 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 2 1 3 6 2 1 2.92 1521/1605 3.03 3.94 4.07 4.09 3.14 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 17 0 Ω 3 3 2 3.30 1424/1514 3.59 4.35 4.39 4.46 3.69 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 17 0 2 3 3.40 1501/1551 3.94 4.66 4.66 4.70 3.98 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 17 0 3 2 3 0 2 2.60 1463/1503 3.09 4.18 4.24 4.28 3.06 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 17 0 1 2 5 0 2 3.00 1403/1506 3.33 4.23 4.26 4.30 3.40 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 20 1 1 0 2 1 2 3.50 \*\*\*\*/1311 3.17 4.08 3.85 3.97 3.52 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2.94 1361/1490 3.05 3.87 4.05 4.11 2.94 3 10 4.17 938/1502 3.87 4.18 4.26 4.28 4.17 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 1 1 4 10 4.06 1025/1489 3.68 4.22 4.29 4.35 4.06 4. Were special techniques successful 9 7 6 3 1 3.27 865/1006 3.02 3.84 4.00 4.10 3.27 Laboratory 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 226 \*\*\*\* 4.08 4.20 4.17 \*\*\*\* 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 25 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 233 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.19 4.13 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25 0 Ω Ω Ω 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 225 \*\*\*\* 4.72 4.50 4.45 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 25 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 223 \*\*\*\* 4.51 4.35 4.27 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 25 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 206 \*\*\*\* 4.69 4.15 4.08 \*\*\*\* 0 0 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 112 \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.38 4.53 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 97 \*\*\*\* 3.56 4.36 4.12 \*\*\*\* 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.22 4.47 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 25 1 Ω 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 105 \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.20 4.45 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 26 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 98 \*\*\*\* 3.39 3.95 4.15 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 58 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.29 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 25 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 40 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.97 3.34 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 25 0 0 0 0 0 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.33 3.49 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.03 \*\*\*\* 26 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55

26 0

0

0

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 1426 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades Re		Reasons	leasons Ty			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Title

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 58 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1427 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

			Fre	quer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	9	11	4	3.65	1414/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	1094/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	6	10	3.85	1095/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	12	4.31	750/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	4	6	6	3.24	1364/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	771/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	6	13	4.00	1043/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	1151/1668	4.68	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	2	5	5	0	3.25	1455/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1166/1514	3.59	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1304/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1301/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1174/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.52
Discussion			_	_		_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	8	3	2		1361/1490	3.05	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	938/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	4	10		1025/1489	3.68	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	6	3	1	3.27	865/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
or word orrotta for grading made orott		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, , ,		3.37	3.75	1.15	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: Questionnaires: 27

Enrollment:

(Instr. D)

58

Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1427 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors		Graduate	0	Major	19	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	С	1	General		Under-grad	27	Non-major	8	
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	24					
				?	0							

Course Section: PSYC 332 0201 University of Maryland Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 24

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1428

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions					Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	1	0	2	6	8	4	3	3 00	1596/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.00
2. Did the instructor			1	0	5	5	5	4	4		1598/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	2.87
3. Did the exam ques			1	0	5	9	3	4	2		1405/1421		4.15	4.24	4.25	2.52
4. Did other evaluat		_	1	0	4	1	5	10	3		1459/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	3.30
5. Did assigned read		_	1	0	8	3	3	7	2		1506/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	2.65
6. Did written assis	_	_	2	0	2	5	2	10	3		1328/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	3.32
7. Was the grading s	_	_	1	0	3	3	4	8	5		1444/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	3.39
8. How many times wa			1	0	0	0	0	1	22		357/1668		4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96
9. How would you gra		ching effectiveness	5	1	4	4	5	5	0		1554/1605			4.07	4.09	3.03
		<u>J</u>														
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct			2	0	3	2	6	5	6	3.41	1407/1514		4.35	4.39	4.46	3.76
2. Did the instructor		_	2	0	1	2	7	5	7	3.68	1475/1551		4.66	4.66	4.70	4.03
3. Was lecture mate	_	-	2	0	7	2	7	3	3		1457/1503		4.18	4.24	4.28	3.40
4. Did the lectures		_	2	0	6	3	5	5	3		1430/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	3.66
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	3	2	2	4	4	4	5	3.32	1037/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.32
	Discussion															
1 Did alasa diasa			_	0	3	1	2	5	2	2 00	1222/1400	2 05	2 07	4 05	1 11	3.06
1. Did class discuss		_	6	0		4 3	3	5 7	3		1322/1490		3.87	4.05	4.11	
2. Were all students			6	0	1 2	3	4 5	5	3		1323/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28 4.35	3.44
<ol> <li>Did the instructor</li> <li>Were special tech</li> </ol>	_	na open alscussion	6 6	12	2	0	3	5 1	0		1367/1489 967/1006		4.22 3.84	4.29	4.35	2.50
4. Were special tech	miiques successiui		0	12	2	U	3	1	U	2.50	967/1006	3.02	3.04	4.00	4.10	2.50
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incre	ease understanding	of the material	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided	d with adequate bac	kground information	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary ma	aterials available	for lab activities	20	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab inst	ructor provide assi	stance	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements	s for lab reports c	learly specified	20	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
	Seminar			_					_							
1. Were assigned to	-		22	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112		4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructo			23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97		3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research pro	-	_	23	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations		-	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105		4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for	r grading made clea	.r	23	0	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 98		3.39	3.95	4.15	
	Field Work															
1. Did field experie		what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly a		_	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
5. Did conferences l			23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
		E	000-	. Diet	- m i h -	. + 4 ~ -	_									
		Frequ	епсу	ומות	TTDI	ac±01	.1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-	-	•	

? 0

Course Section: PSYC 332 0201 University of Maryland Title

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2006

I

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 24

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1429

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 2 6 8 4 3 3.00 1596/1669 3.37 4.22 4.23 4.28 3.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 5 5 5 4 4 2.87 1598/1666 3.50 4.13 4.19 4.20 2.87 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 5 9 3 4 2 2.52 1405/1421 3.37 4.15 4.24 4.25 2.52 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 4 1 5 10 3 3.30 1459/1617 3.93 4.15 4.15 4.22 3.30 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 8 3 3 7 2 2.65 1506/1555 2.95 4.05 4.00 4.03 2.65 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 5 2 10 3 3.32 1328/1543 3.84 4.00 4.06 4.14 3.32 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 3 3 4 8 5 3.39 1444/1647 3.69 4.15 4.12 4.14 3.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 22 4.96 357/1668 4.68 4.77 4.67 4.68 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 1 1 3 4 2 3.45 1378/1605 3.03 3.94 4.07 4.09 3.03 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 15 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 1166/1514 3.59 4.35 4.39 4.46 3.76 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 00 0 5 3 4.38 1284/1551 3.94 4.66 4.66 4.70 4.03 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 1 0 3 4 4.13 996/1503 3.09 4.18 4.24 4.28 3.40 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 1 6 4.50 642/1506 3.33 4.23 4.26 4.30 3.66 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 17 4 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 \*\*\*\*/1311 3.17 4.08 3.85 3.97 3.32 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 3 3 5 3 3.06 1322/1490 3.05 3.87 4.05 4.11 3.06 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 3 4 7 3 3.44 1323/1502 3.87 4.18 4.26 4.28 3.44 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 2 3 5 5 3 3.22 1367/1489 3.68 4.22 4.29 4.35 3.22 4. Were special techniques successful 6 12 2 0 3 1 0 2.50 967/1006 3.02 3.84 4.00 4.10 2.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 20 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 \*\*\*\* 4.08 4.20 4.17 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 20 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00\*\*\*\*/233\*\*\*\*\*4.50\*4.19\*4.13\*\*\*\*\*3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 20 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 225 \*\*\*\* 4.72 4.50 4.45 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 20 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 \*\*\*\* 4.51 4.35 4.27 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 20 1 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 \*\*\*\* / 206 \*\*\*\* 4.69 4.15 4.08 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 22 1 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 112 \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.38 4.53 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 97 \*\*\*\* 3.56 4.36 4.12 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.22 4.47 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 105 \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.20 4.45 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 98 \*\*\*\* 3.39 3.95 4.15 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 58 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.22 4.29 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 23 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* / 30 \*\*\*\* 4.33 3.49 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 8
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 3
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 5 D 1
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 19 General 0 Under-grad 24 Non-major 5 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

17

? 0

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: FREUND, LISA

Enrollment: 48

Questionnaires: 46

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1430

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	13	0	4	8	9	8	4	3.00	1596/1669	3.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	5	10	11	3	4	2.73	1618/1666	3.50	4.13	4.19	4.20	2.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	2	3	4	14	5	5	3.16	1332/1421	3.37	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	2	2	11	7	11	3.70	1284/1617	3.93	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	4	11	5	7	2	4	2.41	1531/1555	2.95	4.05	4.00	4.03	2.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	1	2	3	9	9	9	3.63	1215/1543	3.84	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	4	7	9	9	4	3.06	1523/1647	3.69	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	13	20		1125/1668		4.77	4.67	4.68	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	5	9	11	2	2	2.55	1558/1605	3.03	3.94	4.07	4.09	2.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	7	9	4	8	5		1477/1514		4.35	4.39	4.46	2.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	2	5	5	13	8		1485/1551	3.94	4.66	4.66	4.70	3.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	7	10	8	7	1		1469/1503	3.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	2.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	9	10	7	6	1		1470/1506	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.30	2.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	7	5	9	4	3	2.68	1207/1311	3.17	4.08	3.85	3.97	2.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	3	5	3	5		1172/1490		3.87	4.05	4.11	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	2	2	3	5	5		1296/1502	3.87	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	3	2	7	0	5		1390/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	3.12
4. Were special techniques successful	29	7	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	****/1006	3.02	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	3	0	1	5	3.89	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	2	1	0	6	4.11	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	2	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	1	0	8		****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	***	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor:

Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 46

Baltimore County FREUND, LISA Fall 2006

Page 1430 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	23
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 120 Questionnaires: 113 Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1431 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies			Tnsi	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	42	0	1	7	13	20	30	4.00	1173/1669	3.97	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	43	0	5	7	14	23	21		1372/1666	3.76	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	42	0	4	8	14	26	19	3.68	1163/1421	3.69	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	42	5	10	11	21	11	13	3.09	1501/1617	3.29	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	42	1	1	5	14	23	27	4.00	773/1555	4.15	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 42	5	12	12	19	9	14	3.02	1408/1543	3.11	4.00	4.06	4.14	3.02
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	42	0	2	3	7	15	44	4.35	728/1647	4.46	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	42	0	1	0	0	46	24		1358/1668		4.77	4.67	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	48	2	6	7	14	24	12	3.46	1374/1605	3.54	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	42	0	2	10	14	18	27	3 22	1303/1514	4.18	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	0	4	5	14	49		1193/1551	4.44	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	7	11	11	22	20		1324/1503		4.18	4.24	4.28	3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	0	7	5	11	14	34		1184/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	41	9	6	4	6			1199/1311			3.85	3.97	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	41	2	0	4	O	5	2.73	1199/1311	3.34	4.00	3.03	3.91	2.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	70	0	10	10	5	9	9	2.93	1366/1490	2.76	3.87	4.05	4.11	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	71	0	7	8	3	9	15	3.40	1338/1502	3.05	4.18	4.26	4.28	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	6	7	6	10	13	3.40	1318/1489	3.32	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	70	38	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1110	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	112	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	112	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	112	U		U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 200		4.09	4.13	4.00	
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	111	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	112	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 30			1.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	112	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	111	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	112	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 120
Questionnaires: 113

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1431 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	50
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	16	C	20	General	9	Under-grad	113	Non-major	63
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	11	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	2						

Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO

Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE

Enrollment: 128
Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1432 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Dept Mean Mear		
General												
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	7	19	22	28	3.93	1253/1669	3.97 4.22	2 4.23 4.28	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	21	27	22		1280/1666			
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	7	21	22	22		1152/1421			
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	7	11	16	11	24		1377/1617			
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	4	9	19	38	4.30	516/1555	4.15 4.05		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	10	9	24	12	16		1355/1543			3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	12	54		401/1647	4.46 4.15		4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	6	0	0	0	27	42		1125/1668			4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	3	26	27	8	3.63	1299/1605	3.54 3.94	4.07 4.09	3.63
Lecture												
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	6	22	45	4.53	763/1514	4.18 4.35	4.39 4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	11	17	43	4.38	1279/1551	4.44 4.66	4.66 4.70	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	2	22	19	26	3.88	1180/1503	3.70 4.18	3 4.24 4.28	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	3	9	10	9	16	26	3.57	1305/1506	3.73 4.23	3 4.26 4.30	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	4	4	13	18	30	3.96	643/1311	3.34 4.08	3 3.85 3.97	3.96
Discussion												
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	11	3	10	2	5	2.58	1424/1490	2.76 3.87	4.05 4.11	2.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	11	4	8	4	6	2.70	1461/1502	3.05 4.18	3 4.26 4.28	3 2.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	4	4	10	5	7	3.23	1365/1489	3.32 4.22	4.29 4.35	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	45	25	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1006	**** 3.84	4.00 4.10	****
Laboratory												
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	74	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	**** 4.50	4.19 4.13	****
Field Work												
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	**** ****	4.22 4.29	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	**** ***	4.06 3.59	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	74	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	**** ***	4.39 3.82	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	**** ***	3.97 3.34	****
Self Paced												
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	75 75	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 55 ****/ 42	**** ***	4.34 4.03 4.31 4.13	
					ŭ	-	Ū	1.00	, 12		1.01 1.10	
Frequ	iency	Dis	trik	utic	n							
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			ТУ	pe	Major	s
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 20		Re	quir	ed f	or M	 Major	`s	2	Graduat	e 0	Major	32
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 22												
56-83 13 2.00-2.99 12 C 17		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 76	Non-major	44
84-150 21 3.00-3.49 17 D 1												
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 10 F 1		El	ecti	ves				3		Means there es to be sig	are not enou mificant	ıgh
I 0		O+	her				5	3	_ CDPOHD	00 &0 519	,	
? 4							2	-				

Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS

Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1433 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	20	14	1 12	1090/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	15	13	12		1288/1666			4.19	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	8	14	16		969/1421		4.15	4.24	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	3	7	12	16		1029/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	10	23		550/1555		4.15	4.15	4.22	4.00
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4	1	0	4	9	17	23 10		1084/1543		4.05	4.00		3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	<del>4</del> 5	_				,				4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	•	2	_	5	6	23		1022/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	0	20	20		1265/1668			4.67	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	4	13	11	4	3.47	1374/1605	3.65	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	a	2.7	4.48	845/1514	4.55	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	٥	12	28		1135/1551		4.66	4.66	4.70	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	6	7	17	12		1197/1503		4.18	4.24	4.28	3.83
	2	0	0	0	7		22		868/1506		4.10	4.24		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	15			,				4.30	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	Т	7	12	17	4.22	470/1311	4.36	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	5	8	8	3	3.11	1314/1490	3.77	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	4	6	8	6	2		1433/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	2.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	4	4	7	6	6		1367/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	18	12	4	5	1	5	0		976/1006		3.84	4.00		2.47
1. Note become commission baccobilar			-	,	_	3	Ŭ	2.17	37071000	3.10	3.01	1.00	1.10	2.17
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
Theory		- D.:	L l la .											

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	А	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	13	General	5	Under-grad	45	Non-major	17
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: PSYC 340 8020 University of Maryland SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY ARTEAGA, SHIRLE

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1434

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

						Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	Ο	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	881/1666	4.04		4.19	4.20	4.25
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	1	1	4	2		1078/1421	3.94	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.88
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	801/1617	4.13	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.25
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	195/1555	4.49	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.71
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	659/1543	4.04	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.25
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	4.50
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1	7		769/1668	4.64	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.88
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	1		1148/1605		3.94	4.07		3.83
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	647/1514		4.35	4.39	4.46	4.63
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0 0	0	0	0	3	5		1083/1551	4.60	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.63
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	4	4		556/1503		4.18	4.24	4.28	4.50
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	5		521/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	4.63
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	264/1311	4.36	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1 Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	3.77	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.43
				ed to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	3		1013/1502	3.42	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.00
		_	_	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	776/1489	3.83	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.43
		echniques succe		a open albeablion	1	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	235/1006		3.84	4.00	4.10	4.50
	_	-																
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3									ajors		0	Graduat		0	Majo		6
28-55						r.e.	quil	a I	⊃⊥ 141¢	a JOES		U	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ce	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General					4	onder -g.	Luu	J	INOII-	iia jui	4		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		EJ.	ecti <sup>.</sup>	765				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoud	rh
JI aa.	U	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		יבני	CCCI	v C D					respons				_	111
				I O		Other						3	I COP OND					

Course Section: PSYC 345 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH Baltimore County Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT Fall 2006

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

14

0

3.00-3.49 10

3.50-4.00 6

Questionnaires: 29

43

University of Maryland Page 1435

Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

1

10

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk		om this course	2	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	448/1669	4.63	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.63
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.67
		estions reflec		_	3	0	0	0	1	6	19	4.69	356/1421	4.69	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.69
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	t the ex	spected goals	3	11	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1487/1617	3.20	4.15	4.15	4.22	3.20
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	bute to	what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	7	18	4.52	332/1555	4.52	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.52
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments conti	ribute 1	to what you learned	2	8	5	3	5	3	3	2.79	1484/1543	2.79	4.00	4.06	4.14	2.79
7. Was th	e grading	g system clear	ly expla	ained	2	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	celled		2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	285/1668	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	335/1605	4.56	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.56
		Lectur			_			_	_				000/454					
		actor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.89
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	2	25	4.93	409/1551	4.93	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.93
	<ol> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>						0	0	0	8	19	4.70	335/1503 326/1506	4.70	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.70
				-	2	0 3	0	0 1	0 1	6	21 12	4.78	,	4.78 4.39	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.78
5. Did au	alovisual	tecnniques er	nnance y	your understanding	3	3	U	Τ	1	9	12	4.39	341/1311	4.39	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.39
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	1	0	8	10	8	3.89	965/1490	3.89	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.89
				ed to participate	2	0	1	0	1	7	18	4.52	622/1502	4.52	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.52
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	800/1489	4.41	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.41
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	essful	_	3	24	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
1 1		~ ~ ~ ~	Paced	1	0.0	0	0	0		-	0	4 00		als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 24	4 00	als als als als
				what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	Ţ	0	1.00	****/ 55 ****/ 46	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
_		acts with the		_	28 28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46 ****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful						U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	****/ 33	***		4.25	3.00	
	Fre						rib	atio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						Red	quire	ed fo	or M	 aior	 S	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 17										-	-			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General						1	.2	Under-g	rad 2	9	Non-	major	7
				_	General											_		

Electives

Other

D 0

1

F

P 0

I 0

?

Title PSYC OF SEX DIFFERENCE

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1436 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	433/1669	4.64		4.23	4.28	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	399/1666	4.64	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	719/1421	4.36	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	684/1617	4.36	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	4		1087/1555	3.73	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	838/1543	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.09
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	713/1647	4.36	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	713/1668	4.90	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	538/1605	4.38	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.28	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.90	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	158/1311		4.08	3.85	3.97	
J. Did addiovisual ecciniques ciniance your understanding	O	U	O	O	O	3	O	1.75	130/1311	1.75	1.00	3.03	3.57	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	289/1490	4.73	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	866/1502	4.27	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	564/1489	4.64	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	694/1006	3.67	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.15	***
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
			_	-	•	-	-		,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 357 0101 University of Maryland Page 1437
Title PSYC OF WOMEN Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 42

0	2.0	Q+	<b>a</b>	T	0
Questionnaires:	39	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor Course Dept		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	0	5	24	4.70	345/1669	4.70	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	1	0	7	21	4.53	516/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	2	1	5	22	4.57	502/1421	4.57	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	0	2		19	4.59	414/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	5	7	17	4.30	516/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	12	1	0	2		11	4.33	580/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	424/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	0	9	18	4.57	320/1605	4.57	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	51/1503	4.96	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	184/1311	4.68	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	_	14	4.81	206/1490			4.05	4.11	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	326/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0		1	0	15	4.88	309/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	3	0	3	2	5	3.46	779/1006	3.46	3.84	4.00	4.10	3.46
_		<u>.</u>	,											
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	itior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	Reasons						Туре			Majors		\$		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 23		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	16
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3			-			-						3 -		
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 6 C 0		Ger	neral	_			1	.3	Under-g	rad 3	9	Non-	major	23
84-150 15 3.00-3.49 12 D 0									3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		Ele	ectiv	res			2 #### -			Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
P 0									responses to be significant			ıt		
I 0		Other				8								
? 0														

Course Section: PSYC 360 0101 University of Maryland Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1438

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD Enrollment: 65 Questionnaires: 35 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain new	6	0	2	3	10	10	4	3.38	1532/1669	3.38	4.22	4.23	4.28	3.38	
2. Did the instruct	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						12	7	3.69	1372/1666	3.69	4.13	4.19	4.20	3.69
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	3	7	6	11	3.82	1106/1421	3.82	4.15	4.24	4.25	3.82
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the expected goals	7	23	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1617	****	4.15	4.15	4.22	***
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to what you learned	7	1	4	2	10	8	3	3.15	1401/1555	3.15	4.05	4.00	4.03	3.15
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute to what you learne	d 7	26	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1543	****	4.00	4.06	4.14	***
7. Was the grading	system clearly explained	7	0	1	1	3	5	18	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.36
8. How many times w	ras class cancelled	7	0	0	1	11	8	8	3.82	1604/1668	3.82	4.77	4.67	4.68	3.82
9. How would you gr	ade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 14	0	1	3	9	6	2	3.24	1461/1605	3.24	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.24
	Lecture														
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	392/1514	4.79	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	1223/1551	4.46	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.46
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	5	9	11	4.04	1050/1503	4.04	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.04
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	6	9	12	4.11	1025/1506	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.11
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	3	2	2	7	11	3.84	738/1311	3.84	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.84
	Discussion														
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	1	3	1	4	3.17	1299/1490	3.17	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.17
2. Were all student	s actively encouraged to participate	23	0	3	0	7	1	1	2.75	1450/1502	2.75	4.18	4.26	4.28	2.75
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.00
4. Were special ted	hniques successful	23	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
	Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grade	s			Reasons					Ту		уре		Majors	;
00-27 2	0 00-0 99 0						in ior		2	Craduat		n	 Maic		1 8

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	10	General	6	Under-grad	35	Non-major	17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				2	2						

Course Section: PSYC 370 0101

SENSATION AND PERCEPTI

Title PROVINE, ROBERT

Instructor:

Enrollment: 144 Questionnaires: 136

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1439 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	:S 4	5	Ins <sup>.</sup> Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean
	General														
	new insights, skills from this course	56	0	4	5	11	21	39		1124/1669		4.22	4.23	4.28	4.07
	uctor make clear the expected goals	57	0	5	11	15	22	26		1380/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	3.6
	questions reflect the expected goals	56	0	5	7	17	24	27		1131/1421		4.15	4.24	4.25	3.76
	luations reflect the expected goals	56	11	9	10	16	21	13		1467/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	3.2
_	readings contribute to what you learned	57	2	3	8	10	34	22		996/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	3.8
	ssignments contribute to what you learned		5	19 3	11	18	17	10		1474/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	2.8
	ng system clearly explained s was class cancelled	57	0	3	5 0	8	17	46		873/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	4.2
_		56 s 67	2	4	6	14	65 28	15 15		1425/1668 1280/1605		4.77 3.94	4.67	4.68	4.1
9. HOW WOULD YOU	grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5 0/	2	4	О	14	28	15	3.00	1280/1605	4.00	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.0
	Lecture														
1. Were the inst	ructor's lectures well prepared	57	0	3	7	18	19	32	3.89	1277/1514	4.30	4.35	4.39	4.46	3.8
	uctor seem interested in the subject	57	0	2	1	6	12	58	4.56	1152/1551	4.63	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.5
	aterial presented and explained clearly	57	0	5	8	17	27	22		1273/1503		4.18	4.24	4.28	3.6
	res contribute to what you learned	59	0	3	10	8	23	33		1132/1506		4.23	4.26	4.30	3.9
5. Did audiovisu	al techniques enhance your understanding	57	40	10	7	9	7	6	2.79	1187/1311	3.74	4.08	3.85	3.97	2.7
	Discussion														
1. Did class dis	cussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	8	5	10	15	11	3.33	1236/1490	3.75	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.3
	ents actively encouraged to participate	87	0	4	3	10	9	23		1123/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	3.9
	uctor encourage fair and open discussion	87	0	6	2	12	18	11	3.53	1266/1489	4.02	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.5
4. Were special	techniques successful	87	45	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	4.10	***
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab i	ncrease understanding of the material	127	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	***
	ided with adequate background information		0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 233		4.50	4.19	4.13	***
	y materials available for lab activities	132	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225			4.50	4.45	***
	Seminar														
1 Were assigned	topics relevant to the announced theme	131	4	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	***
	ions contribute to what you learned	134	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105		4.06	4.20	4.45	***
1. Dia piosonoao	Tone concertation to what you rearrow	101	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 100		1.00	1120	1.15	
	Field Work				_	_	_								
1. Did field exp	erience contribute to what you learned	134	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	***	****	4.22	4.29	***
	Self Paced														
1. Did self-pace	d system contribute to what you learned	134	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	***
3. Were your con	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful					0	0	0	1.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	***
	Fi														
Credits Earned	3			R∈	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27 3						 Io <del>-</del>		1			0				
00-27 3 28-55 7	0.00-0.99 0 A 20 1.00-1.99 0 B 40	red f	or M	ıa Jor	ສ	1	Graduat	e	U	Majo	)T.	58			

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	1	Graduate (	 0	Major	58
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	40						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	C	16	General	6	Under-grad 136	б	Non-major	78
84-150	26	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means th	here ar	re not enougl	ı
				P	0			responses to be	e signi	ificant	
				I	0	Other	66				
				2	0						

Course Section: PSYC 370 8020

SENSATION AND PERCEPTI

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 38

Questionnaires: 34

ALONSO, DIANE

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1440

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	10	17	4.26	901/1669	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	23	4.53	527/1666	4.10	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8		12	3.97		3.87		4.24	4.25	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	7	21	4.41	641/1617	3.84	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	5	18	4.12	698/1555	3.97		4.00	4.03	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	5	20	4.43	478/1543	3.64	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	26	4.62	356/1647	4.43	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1668	4.59	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	10	15		578/1605		3.94	4.07	4.09	4.34
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	O	_	3	10	13	1.51	37071003	1.00	3.51	1.07	1.05	1.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	27	4.71	522/1514	4.30	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	26	4.70	986/1551	4.63	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	5	22	4.50	556/1503	4.09	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	25	4.58	575/1506	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	3	25	4.68	184/1311	3.74	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.68
Discussion	•	0	_	-	_	_	1.0	4 10	EEC /1 100	2 55	2 0 1	4 05	4 11	4 10
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	7	19	4.18	756/1490	3.75	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	6	21	4.29	852/1502	4.10	4.18	4.26	4.28	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	1	5	25	4.50	684/1489	4.02	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	1	4	3	16	4.42	299/1006	4.42	3.84	4.00	4.10	4.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.69	4.15	4.08	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	2	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.22	4.47	****
-	32	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	***/ 98		3.39	3.95	4.15	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
0.15														
Self Paced	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 55	****	++++	4 2 4	4 02	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33 33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55 ****/ 42	****		4.34	4.03	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	-	-	_		,	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	U	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	^ ^ ^ *	^ ^ <del>X</del>	4.45	4.13	^ ^ ^ <del>x</del>

Course Section: PSYC 370 8020

Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI

Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1440 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	34	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 380 0101 University of Maryland Page 1441
Title PERSONALITY Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 56

Ouestionnaires:	44	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questions		NR	NA		eque:		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills	from this source	1	0	0	2	5	19	17	1 10	1001/1669	4.19	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear th		1	0	2	2	7	18	14		1192/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect t		1	0	1	3	8	18			1061/1421		4.15	4.24	4.25	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect th		1	39	1	0	0	0	3		****/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute	1 3	1	0	4	3	8	11	17		1029/1555		4.05	4.00	4.03	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribu		1	39	0	0	0	1	3		****/1543		4.00	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly e		1	1	1	1	1	4	35	4.69			4.15	4.12		4.69
8. How many times was class cancell		1	0	0	0	0	38	5		1470/1668		4.77	4.67		4.12
9. How would you grade the overall		6	1	0	0	6	18	13	4.19	769/1605		3.94	4.07	4.09	4.19
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures w	ell prepared	2	0	1	0	4	10	27	4.48	845/1514	4.48	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interest		2	0	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	567/1551	4.88	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented a	nd explained clearly	4	0	0	2	4	16	18	4.25	879/1503	4.25	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to w	hat you learned	2	0	0	3	2	9	28	4.48	680/1506	4.48	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhar	ce your understanding	2	13	2	4	3	11	9	3.72	807/1311	3.72	4.08	3.85	3.97	3.72
Discussio	n														
1. Did class discussions contribute	-	24	0	6	2	3	5	4		1355/1490		3.87	4.05	4.11	2.95
<ol><li>Were all students actively encor</li></ol>		23	0	3	1	3	5	9		1202/1502		4.18	4.26	4.28	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fai	r and open discussion	23	0	1	1	1	7	11	4.24	930/1489	4.24	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.24
Self Pac															
1. Did self-paced system contribute	to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
	Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99	 A 7		Red	 quire	ed fo	 or M	 aior	 `s	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	30
28-55 1 1.00-1.99	В 25		_				J						5		
56-83 7 2.00-2.99 4	C 5		Gei	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 4	.4	Non-	major	14
84-150 14 3.00-3.49 14	D 0													-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				3	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0		Otl	her				2	9	_		_			
	? 1														

Course Section: PSYC 385 0201

Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 51

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1442 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

	Questions							ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne		s from this course	17	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	115/1669	4.91	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.91
		ctor make clear th		15	0	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.75
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect t	the expected goals	17	0	0	0	1	5	28	4.79	229/1421	4.79	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.79
		uations reflect th		17	2	0	0	8	5	19	4.34	706/1617	4.34	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.34
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribute	e to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	8	24	4.59	277/1555	4.59	4.05	4.00	4.03	4.59
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contribu	ate to what you learned	17	0	0	1	3	12	18	4.38	534/1543	4.38	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.38
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly e	explained	17	0	3	3	4	8	16	3.91	1149/1647	3.91	4.15	4.12	4.14	3.91
8. How ma	any times	was class cancell	Led	17	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	641/1668	4.91	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.91
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	182/1605	4.74	3.94	4.07	4.09	4.74
		Lecture															
		uctor's lectures v		18	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	189/1514		4.35	4.39	4.46	4.91
			ted in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.70	5.00
			and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.88
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.88
5. Did av	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	1	3	6	10	4.10	542/1311	4.10	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.10
		on															
			e to what you learned	30	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	433/1490	4.52	3.87	4.05	4.11	4.52
			ıraged to participate	29	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82			4.18	4.26	4.28	4.82
			ir and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	280/1489		4.22	4.29	4.35	4.90
4. Were s	special te	echniques successf	Eul	31	13	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
		Seminar															
1. Were a	assigned t	topics relevant to	the announced theme	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.53	****
		Field Wor	= = =														
1. Did fi	ield expe	rience contribute	to what you learned	49	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
			Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						Rea	ason	S			Ту	ре			Majors	5
00-27						 ຫນຳຕ	ed f	or Ma	 aior		3	 Graduat	e	 0	Majo	 or	16
28-55					1100	2011	ca I	OI 110	۱۰۲ د	_	5	Graduat		J	1.100 ) (	<i>,</i> _	10
56-83	6-83 5 2.00-2.99 4 C 0					nera	1			1	.4	Under-g	rad 5	51	Non-	-major	35
84-150																	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					ecti	ves				0	#### - respons				_	gh
	I 0									1	.4	100,0110					

Course Section: PSYC 387 0101 University of Maryland

Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE Fall 2006

Instructor: BRODSKY, A
Enrollment: 40

Enrollment: 40
Ouestionnaires: 40

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1443

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 14 0 0 7 15 4.38 757/1669 4.38 4.22 4.23 4.28 4.38 14 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 5 9 12 4.27 868/1666 4.27 4.13 4.19 4.20 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 14 0 02 2 10 12 4.23 831/1421 4.23 4.15 4.24 4.25 4.23 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 14 0 0 1 3 11 11 4.23 821/1617 4.23 4.15 4.15 4.22 4.23 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.42 418/1555 4.42 4.05 4.00 4.03 4.42 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 14 0 0771/1543 4.15 4.00 4.06 4.14 4.15 1 5 9 11 4.15 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 14 0 0 2 2 10 12 4.23 885/1647 4.23 4.15 4.12 4.14 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 14 0 0 0 0 0 26 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.77 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 0 1 3 12 10 4.19 759/1605 4.19 3.94 4.07 4.09 4.19 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 Ω 1 1 5 19 4.62 663/1514 4.62 4.35 4.39 4.46 4.62 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 0 0 3 23 4.88 567/1551 4.88 4.66 4.66 4.70 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 0 0 1 5 19 4.72 323/1503 4.72 4.18 4.24 4.28 4.72 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 2 6 18 4.62 534/1506 4.62 4.23 4.26 4.30 4.62 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 1 1 2 3 6 12 4.08 547/1311 4.08 4.08 3.85 3.97 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2.3 0 0 3 5 9 4.35 604/1490 4.35 3.87 4.05 4.11 4.35 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 0 3 1 13 4.59 558/1502 4.59 4.18 4.26 4.28 4.59 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 0 2 2 13 4.65 553/1489 4.65 4.22 4.29 4.35 4.65 4. Were special techniques successful 23 0 1 7 3 5 3.59 735/1006 3.59 3.84 4.00 4.10 3.59 Field Work 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 58 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.22 4.29 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 39 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.06 3.59 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 39 0 Ω Ω 39 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.39 3.82 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 39 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 40 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 3.97 3.34 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	11	Under-grad	40	Non-major	25
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_		_	
				2	0						

Course Section: PSYC 390 0101

Title NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG

Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 19

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1444 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1 Did you gain new	w insights,skills fr	com this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4 37	781/1669	4.37	4.22	4.23	4.28	4.37
	tor make clear the $\epsilon$		1	0	1	0	4	7	6		1178/1666		4.13	4.19	4.20	3.94
	estions reflect the		0	0	1	2	1	6	9	4.05	950/1421	4.05	4.15	4.24	4.25	4.05
_	ations reflect the e	_	0	16	0	0	1	1	1		****/1617	****	4.15	4.15	4.22	***
	adings contribute to	1 3	1	0	1	0	4	3	10		644/1555	4.17	4.05	4.00		4.17
	system clearly expl		3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	345/1647	4.63	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.63
8. How many times v	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1157/1668	4.56	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.56
9. How would you gr	rade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1261/1605	3.69	3.94	4.07	4.09	3.69
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	ctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	553/1514	4.68	4.35	4.39	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instruct	tor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1097/1551	4.61	4.66	4.66	4.70	4.61
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	1005/1503	4.11	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.11
4. Did the lectures	s contribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	892/1506	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.30	4.28
5. Did audiovisual	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	1	7	10	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.97	4.50
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to	what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.87	4.05	4.11	3.00
2. Were all student	ts actively encourag	ged to participate	14	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1467/1502	2.60	4.18	4.26	4.28	2.60
3. Did the instruct	tor encourage fair a	and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.00	4.22	4.29	4.35	3.00
4. Were special ted	chniques successful		14	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.10	****
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab inco	rease understanding	of the material	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.17	****
2. Were you provide	ed with adequate bac	ekground information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.13	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field experi	ience contribute to	what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly	understand your eva	aluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	***
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced s	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8	-					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	4	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	13
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				2	Λ	Other					

Course Section: PSYC 636 0101
Title Primary Prevention
Instructor: Brown, Lewis
Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 7

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 3 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	0	0	1	4	2	1 11	1052/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	٥		1273/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	0		****/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0		1196/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.33		****	4.12	4.15	3.99	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	0		1076/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	651/1647	****	3.90	4.12	4.06	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	****	4.72	4.12	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	3	0		1391/1605	***	3.90	4.07	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	4	3	U	3.43	1391/1005	***	3.90	4.07	3.96	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1295/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4		1135/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	0		1389/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	0		1426/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	0	0	0		****/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	****
	-		•	_			-		,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	778/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 112	****	4.53	4.38	4.04	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	4.17	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.80	3.95	3.90	****
Frequ	.encv	Dist	rib	ation	ı									
11040					-									

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

Course Section: PSYC 399 0130
Title Cooperative Educ in Psychology

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 4 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies 1			Inst	Instructor Course Dept			UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did voi	u dain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	243/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	370/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.63
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	996/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	3.83
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	390/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.50
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	213/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.7
		was class canc		11100	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	4.7
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	538/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	4.38
		Lectur	e															
L. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.86
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	5.0
. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	5.0
. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin						0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	4.4
	Discussion																	
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	5.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	5.00
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	5.00
l. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	***
		Field																
	_			hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.70	4.22	4.00	***
				uation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.53	4.06	3.81	***
1. To what	t degree	could you disc	uss you	r evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	2.40	3.97	4.00	***
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 5	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0		_	=			J						5 -		_
56-83			Ge	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	0			
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-			-		5	ŭ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	rh
				P 0							<del>-</del>		respons					
				I O	Other					1			5-					
				3 0														

Course Section: PSYC 400 0101

Title SEM IN DEVELOPMENTL PS

Instructor: SONNENSCHEIN, S

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1445 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	2	_	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5 5	0	0	1	2	2	2		1250/1666	3.89	4.22	4.23	4.39	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5 5	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.19	4.22	4.00
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	4	1	4		1029/1421	4.00	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.00
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals . Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	301/1555	4.56	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.56
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	583/1647	4.44	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	750/1668	4.89	4.77	4.12	4.70	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	5	3	1		1334/1605	3.56	3.94	4.07	4.16	3.56
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		U	U	U	,	5	_	3.30	1334/1003	3.30	3.71	1.07	1.10	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.89	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	6		1028/1551	4.67	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	3	4		1005/1503	4.11	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	3		1017/1506		4.23	4.26	4.29	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.50
5. Dia addiovidual ocomingaco cimanoc your anacipounaring		_	Ū	Ū	ŭ	-	-	1.50	201, 1011	1.50	1.00	3.03	3.00	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1209/1489	3.71	4.22	4.29	4.52	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.86	* * * *

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

Course Section: PSYC 406 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1446

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY Fall 2006 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 25

St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	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	3	5	13	4.48	633/1669	4.48	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.48
2.	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	662/1666	4.43	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.43
3.	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	594/1421	4.48	4.15	4.24	4.38	4.48
4.	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	993/1617	4.06	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.06
5.	. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	255/1555	4.62	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.62
6.	. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1152/1543	3.74	4.00	4.06	4.18	3.74
7.	. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	458/1647	4.52	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.52
8.	. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.43
9.	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	678/1605	4.26	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.26
	Lecture														
1.	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	974/1514	4.38	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.38
2.	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.90
3.	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	653/1503	4.45	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.45
4.	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	484/1506	4.65	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.65
5.	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	531/1311	4.11	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.11
	Discussion														
1.	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	816/1490	4.08	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.08
2.	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.50
3.	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	973/1489	4.17	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.17
4.	. Were special techniques successful	13	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.21	****
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Cı	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	1	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	8
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				2	1						

Course Section: PSYC 407 8020 University of Maryland Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 20

Page 1447 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	135/1669	4.89	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	110/1666	4.89	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.15	4.24	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	146/1617	4.83	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	285/1555	4.58	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	195/1543	4.74	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	67/1647	4.95	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1177/1668	4.53	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	239/1605	4.67	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	473/1514	4.74	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.95	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	182/1503	4.84	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	98/1506	4.94	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	214/1311	4.61	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.61
Discussion	_	_			_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	289/1490	4.72	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	299/1489	4.89	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	185/1006	4.65	3.84	4.00	4.21	4.65
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goar			•	3	,	_	Ü	00	, 12				2.00	
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there		are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	1						

Course Section: PSYC 409 0101 University of Maryland

Title DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT Baltimore County Instructor: SONNENSCHEIN, S Fall 2006

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18

Student C	Ourge Eva	luation ∩	meetic	nnaire

Page 1448

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Overtions						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	1	0	8	8	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.17
	1 0	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	3	6	8		1028/1666		4.13	4.19	4.22	4.11
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	0	2	10	5	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.38	4.00
	-	uations reflect		_	0	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11			4.15	4.15	4.22	4.11
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17			4.05	4.00	4.08	4.17
				o what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	7	5		1076/1543		4.00	4.06	4.18	3.83
		g system clearl			0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	682/1647	4.39	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.39
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1400/1668	4.22	4.77	4.67	4.70	4.22
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	9	2	3.65	1286/1605	3.65	3.94	4.07	4.16	3.65
	-																	
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.35	4.39	4.45	4.44
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.66	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0		1	1	10	5	3.94	1127/1503	3.94	4.18	4.24	4.27	3.94
4. Did	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	892/1506	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.28
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	4	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	983/1311	3.43	4.08	3.85	3.88	3.43
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	-	0	0	0	3			232/1490		3.87	4.05	4.26	4.79
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1502		4.18	4.26	4.46	4.86
		_		d open discussion	4	0	0		1	4	9	4.57	622/1489		4.22	4.29		4.57
4. Were	e special t	echniques succe	ssful		4	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	430/1006	4.15	3.84	4.00	4.21	4.15
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						guire	 ed fo	 or M	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			-1 ~ -1 ,			)	-	-	or addac	-	-		_	
56-83						Gei	nera:	l				3	Under-q	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	0
	84-150 7 3.00-3.49 2 D 0											-			-		5	-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	h
P 1										<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>								
	I 0					Ot1	her				1	.3	-		3			
	? 0																	

SEM IN COGNITIVE PSYC Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 1449 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	8				
Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course Section: PSYC 415 0101

GRONINGER, LOWE

Title

Instructor:

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.15	4.24	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.15	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.08	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551		4.66	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.6
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.29	5.0
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311		4.08	3.85	3.88	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50			4.18	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1		0	0	0	1	1	4.50			4.22	4.29	4.52	4.50
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5

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

Course Section: PSYC 480 8020 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN PERSONALITY

ANDERSON, ROBER

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1450

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions						Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Tnst	tructor	Course	e Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	-	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.71
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	293/1666		4.13	4.19	4.22	4.7
		uestions reflec			1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421		4.15	4.24	4.38	5.0
	_	uations reflect			1	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617		4.15	4.15	4.22	4.7
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555		4.05	4.00	4.08	4.5
				to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	783/1543		4.00	4.06	4.18	4.1
		g system clearl			1	2	0	1	1	1	2		1250/1647		4.15	4.12	4.14	3.8
		was class canc		zinea	1	0	0	0	0	7	0		1530/1668		4.77	4.67	4.70	4.0
				ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5		194/1605		3.94			4.7
. HOW WO	dia you	grade the overa	.ii cea	Jilling effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	2	,	4.71	194/1003	4.71	3.94	4.07	4.10	1./
		Lectur	-															
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514		4.35	4.39	4.45	4.7
		ctor seem inter		3	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.73	5.0
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.7
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.8
. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.0
	Discussion																	
. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	177/1490	4.86	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.8
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502		4.18	4.26	4.46	5.0
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489		4.22	4.29	4.52	5.0
		echniques succe		ia open alboabbien	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006		3.84	4.00	4.21	4.6
		Semina																
Wows	aaianad		_	e announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 112	****	1 06	4.38	4.74	***
	_	-		dividual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97		4.06 3.56	4.36	4.74	***
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		3.63	4.22	4.48	***
		ons contribute			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105		4.06	4.22	4.40	***
_		ons contribute for grading mad		-	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 98		3.39	3.95	3.86	***
. were c	ericeria .	for grading mad	e crea	2	,	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	^^^/ 98		3.39	3.95	3.80	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	\$
00-27				 A 5					or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		1/6/	40TI	cu I	J. 1110	الماري	5	J	Graduat		J	Majo	) <u>+</u>	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	В 2 С 0		Gor	nera	1				4	Under-o	rad	8	Non	-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gei	лста.	_				_	onder -g	ı au	J	11011-	iia jul	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		רם.	ecti	1700				0	#### -	Means +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		17.7	LULI	vca				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	ner					3	respons	es to I	e sign	ıııcaı	16	
				5 U		OEI	ier					3						
				? 0														

Course Section: PSYC 493A 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV.PSYC.TPCS: PNI Baltimore County Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN Fall 2006

Enrollment:

23

University of Maryland Page 1451
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires: 23	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
-------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------	--

					Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new i		rom this course	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor	_		7	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam quest			7	15	0	0	0	0	1		****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluati			7	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readi			7	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	249/1555	4.63	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.63
6. Did written assign			7	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.60
7. Was the grading sy			7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	161/1647	4.81	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was	class cancelled		7	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grad	le the overall tea	aching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	111/1605	4.88	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.88
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructo		l prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor			8	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture materi		3	7	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	210/1503	4.81	4.18	4.24	4.27	4.81
4. Did the lectures of	-	-	7	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.75
5. Did audiovisual te		-	7	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	291/1311	4.47	4.08	3.85	3.88	4.47
	- ·															
1 544 -1 44	Discussion			0	0	0	_	_	-	4 22	600/1400	4 22	2 07	4 05	1 00	4 22
1. Did class discussi		-	8	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.87	4.05	4.26	4.33
<ol> <li>Were all students</li> <li>Did the instructor</li> </ol>			8 8	0	0	0	1	1	12 13	4.80	336/1502 378/1489	4.80 4.80	4.18	4.26 4.29	4.46 4.52	4.80 4.80
4. Were special techr	-	and open discussion	8	2	0	0	U T	4	13	4.69	167/1006	4.80	3.84	4.29	4.52	4.80
4. Were special tecin	iiques successiui		0	۷	U	U	U	4	9	4.09	167/1006	4.09	3.04	4.00	4.21	4.09
	Seminar															
<ol> <li>Were assigned topi</li> </ol>			22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor			22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.69	****
<ol><li>Did research proje</li></ol>			22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations			22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear		ar	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.86	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	oe			Majors	}

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 493B 0101

Title ADV.PSYC.TPCS:SOC/HEAL

Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1452 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	77/1669	4.94	4.22	4.23	4.39	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	715/1666	4.39	4.13	4.19	4.22	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	277/1617	4.71	4.15	4.15	4.22	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	255/1555	4.61	4.05	4.00	4.08	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	164/1543	4.78	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	1	12	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.15	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	8		1240/1668		4.77	4.67	4.70	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	373/1605	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.16	4.50
Lecture	_					_			400/4544					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	489/1514			4.39	4.45	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	556/1503		4.18	4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	-	0	0		16	4.94	98/1506		4.23	4.26	4.29	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.88	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.87	4.05	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	168/1489	4.94	4.22	4.29	4.52	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	617/1006	3.88	3.84	4.00	4.21	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	29/ 112	4.93	4.06	4.38	4.74	4.93
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	46/ 97	4.62	3.56	4.36	4.69	4.62
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	39/ 92	4.62	3.63	4.22	4.48	4.62
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	24/ 105	4.93	4.06	4.20	4.27	4.93
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	40/ 98	4.29	3.39	3.95	3.86	4.29
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
		-	-	-	-	_	-		, 12					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	0						

Course Section: PSYC 601A 0101 University of Maryland Page 1453
Title INTERVIEWING Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Instructor: CARLTON, CHRIST Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 9

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1507/1669	3.44	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	1	1	3.22	1545/1666	3.22	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1473/1617	3.25	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1163/1555	3.63	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1516/1543	2.50	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1435/1514	3.22	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.78	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1277/1503	3.67	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1236/1506	3.78	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	116/1311	4.80	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	Ο	0	1	2	6	4.56	417/1490	4.56	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	486/1502		4.18	4.26	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	640/1489		4.22	4.29	4.44	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	453/1006		3.84	4.00	4.11	4.11
	J	ŭ	•	-	_	-	-		100, 1000		3.01	1.00		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	2			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	Λ						

Course Section: PSYC 601D 0101 U

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Instructor: BAKER, LINDA

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 12

Page 1454 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions 				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1520/166	9 3.42	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.42
-	_	tor make clear			0	0	4	1	2	5	0		1624/166		4.13	4.19	4.19	2.67
		estions reflect			0	8	0	1	2	1	0		1357/142		4.15	4.24	4.33	3.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	1	5	5	1	0		1591/161		4.15	4.15	4.24	2.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	5	3	3	1		1427/155		4.05	4.00	4.07	3.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	2	3	3	2	2	0	2.30	1527/154	3 2.30	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.30
		system clearly		-	0	0	4	3	1	4	0	2.42	1596/164	7 2.42	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.42
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/166		4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	5	2		1210/160			4.07		3.75
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1199/151	4 4.00	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.00
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1330/155	1 4.27	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.27
				xplained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1066/150	3 4.00	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.00
		s contribute to		-	1	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1219/150	3.82	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.82
				our understanding	1	1	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	764/131	1 3.80	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.80
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu			what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1328/149	3.00	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	1	3	4	4		1106/150		4.18	4.26	4.46	3.92
		_	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	4	4		1155/148		4.22	4.29	4.44	3.83
		chniques succes			0	2	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	,		3.84	4.00		2.50
		Semina	^															
1. Were a	assigned t			announced theme	1	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.18	97/ 11	2 3.18	4.06	4.38	4.39	3.18
				ividual attention	1	0	2	1	5	0	3	3.09	90/ 9		3.56	4.36	4.38	3.09
				what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	3	1	2.91	85/ 9		3.63	4.22	4.36	2.91
	_	ns contribute t		_	1	0	2	1	4	3	1	3.00	92/ 10		4.06	4.20	4.23	3.00
_		or grading made		1	1	0	4	3	3	1	0	2.09	91/ 9		3.39	3.95	3.93	2.09
		Field W	Jork															
1. Did fi	ield exper			hat you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 5	8 ****	****	4.22	4.53	***
				Frequ	encv	. Dist	trib	ut i o	n									
		_	circy	DID	C1 120	uc10.												
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				T;	уре 			Majors 	; 			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	0	Gradua	te :	10	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-	grad	2	Non-	-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0		Means			_	jh
				P 0								_	respon	ses to 1	oe sigr	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	2						
				3 0														

Course Section: PSYC 601E 0101 University of Maryland Title CORE I Baltimore County Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

13

University of Maryland Page 1455
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ι

0

	Questions						Fre	equer	cies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	2	3	4	3	0	2.67	1634/1669	2.67	4.22	4.23	4.35	2.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	5	2	3	2	0	2.17	1656/1666	5 2.17	4.13	4.19	4.19	2.17
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	8	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1390/1421	2.75	4.15	4.24	4.33	2.75
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	2.25	1606/1617	7 2.25	4.15	4.15	4.24	2.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	5	4	2	0	2.58	1515/1555	2.58	4.05	4.00	4.07	2.58
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	4	3	1	2	0	2.10	1533/1543	3 2.10	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.10
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	4	3	2	3	0	2.33	1600/1647	7 2.33	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.33
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	3 4.92	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.92
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	2.42	1567/1605	2.42	3.94	4.07	4.13	2.42
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	1	1	5	4	1		1431/1514		4.35	4.39	4.37	3.25
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	3	1	3	5		1456/1551		4.66	4.66	4.72	3.83
				xplained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	4			1393/1503		4.18	4.24	4.22	3.25
		es contribute t			0	0	3	2	3	3	1		1436/1506		4.23	4.26	4.24	
5. Did au	diovisua.	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	4	2	4	2	3.33	1027/1311	L 3.33	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.33
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	2	1		1410/1490		3.87	4.05	4.18	2.73
				d to participate	1	0	1	1	4	2	3		1319/1502		4.18	4.26	4.46	3.45
				d open discussion	1	0 2	1 1	3 4	3	2 1	2		1393/1489		4.22	4.29	4.44	3.09
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succe	SSIUI		1	۷	Т	4	3	Τ	U	2.44	980/1006	2.44	3.84	4.00	4.11	2.44
		Semina																
				announced theme	1	0	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	98/ 112		4.06	4.38	4.39	3.00
				ividual attention	1	0	4	1	4	0	2	2.55	94/ 97		3.56	4.36	4.38	2.55
	_	-		what you learned	1	0	3	0	3	4		3.00	77/ 92		3.63	4.22	4.36	3.00
		ons contribute			1	0	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	91/ 105		4.06	4.20	4.23	3.09
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear		1	0	4	2	5	0	0	2.09	91/ 98	3 2.09	3.39	3.95	3.93	2.09
		Self	Paced															
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ution	1									
Credita E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Pes	sons	,			ጥ፣	<i>7</i> pe			Majors	
										, 								
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	9	Majo	or	0
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4					a		,				0	77 d		2	37 -		1.0
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera.	L				0	Under-9	grad	3	Non-	-major	12
84-150 Grad.	0 9	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0 6	D 0 F 0		רם.	ectiv	700				0	####	Means	-hero -	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	J	3.30-4.00	Ö	Р 0		E.T.	=CL1\	ves				U	#### - respons				_	11
				P 0		0+1	h 0 30				1	2	respons	ocs LU I	oe sigi	iiiidl	10	

Other

12

#### Course Section: PSYC 601F 0101 University of Maryland Title POVERTY AND CONSEQUENC Baltimore County Fall 2006

SONNENSCHEIN, S

Instructor: Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1456

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Questions					3.7.7		_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.50
		estions reflect			0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	340/1555		4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.75
		system clearl		2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605				4.13	4.00
1 77	Lecture ere the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	^	0	0	_	_	4 50	700/1514	4 50	4 25	4 20	4 27	4 50
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	∠ 1		4.50	799/1514			4.39		4.50
					0		0	1 0	0 1	1			1404/1551	4.00	4.66		4.72	
	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	2		4.25	879/1503 642/1506		4.18	4.24	4.22	
				you rearned our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.50	. ,				3.89	
5. Did aud	iiovisuai	t techniques en	nance y	our understanding	U	U	U	U	1	U	3	4.50	204/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.25
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	920/1489	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.25
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	5.00
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	-ribı	ıt i oı	า									
				11040	.01107	215			-									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	рe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	e	3	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			_						3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				4	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	rad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	P 0					Otl	ner					0	_					
				? 0														

# Course Section: PSYC 605 0101 University of Maryland Title LEARNING AND COGNITION Baltimore County

Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1457

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1527/1666	3.33	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	0	2	3	4	3.42	1273/1421	3.42	4.15	4.24	4.33	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1251/1617	3.75	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1195/1543	3.67	4.00	4.06	4.27	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	3	4	3.50	1393/1647	3.50	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1164/1605	3.82	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1449/1514	3.09	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	6	2	3.50	1330/1503	3.50	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	0	5	3.27	1372/1506	3.27	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	846/1311	3.67	4.08	3.85	3.89	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1395/1490	2.80	3.87	4.05	4.18	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	4	1	1	3		1392/1502	3.10	4.18	4.26	4.46	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1434/1489	2.80	4.22	4.29	4.44	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	1	0	0	0		****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	***

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

Course Section: PSYC 606 0101 University of Maryland ADULT PSYCHOPATHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

Page 1458 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescromatie

							Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou o	ain new :		=	this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1052/1669	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.14
		r make clear			0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1353/1666	3.71	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.71
		tions reflect			0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.00
	_	ions reflect			0	2	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.00
5. Did assig	ned read	ings contribu	ıte to w	hat you learned	l 0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.43
6. Did writt	en assign	nments contr	ibute to	what you learr	ned 0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.00
7. Was the o	rading s	ystem clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1205/1647	3.86	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.86
8. How many	times was	s class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would	l you grad	de the overa	ll teach	ing effectivene	ess 2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1400/1605	3.40	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.40
		Lecture	_															
1 Were the	instruct	or's lectures		repared	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	2 14	1444/1514	2 14	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.14
				the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	1		1452/1551	3.86	4.66	4.66	4.72	3.86
				plained clearly	-	-	0	0	3	4	0		1309/1503		4.18	4.24	4.22	3.57
					0	0	0	0	2	2	3		995/1506		4.23	4.26	4.24	4.14
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understan				na 2		0	1	1	0	0		1227/1311			3.85		2.50
J. Dia addic	VIBUAL C	cciniiques em	lance yo	ar anderstandin	19 2	3	U	_	_	O	U	2.50	122//1311	2.50	1.00	3.03	3.05	2.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class	discuss	ions contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	l 0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	405/1490	4.57	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.57
2. Were all	students	actively end	couraged	to participate	9 0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	859/1502	4.29	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.29
				open discussion	on 0	-	0	0	0	3	4		622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.57
4. Were spec	ial tech	niques succes	ssful		0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.84	4.00	4.11	3.50
				Fγ	equenc	v Die	etrih	ut i o	n									
				1.1	cquenc	y Di.	SCIID	ucio.										
Credits Earn	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 2					 Re	 equir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	- – – - 3	0	Graduat	 e	7	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			-			,						3		
	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	enera	1				0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													_	
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E	lecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		01	ther					5						
	. 0 . 0																	

Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I

Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 31 Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1459 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General		_			_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	16	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669		4.22	4.23	4.35	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	268/1666		4.13	4.19	4.19	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421		4.15	4.24	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	554/1617		4.15	4.15	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0		12	4.80	141/1555		4.05	4.00	4.07	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1		10	4.60	298/1543		4.00	4.06	4.27	4.60
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	16	0	0	1	0		10	4.53	446/1647		4.15	4.12	4.15	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668		4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	194/1605	4.23	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1514	4.73	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	4.61	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1		12	4.73	300/1503	4.41	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1		4.93	115/1506		4.23	4.26	4.24	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	12	0	1	0	0	2		****/1311		4.08	3.85		4.08
J. Did additivibual econniques emidiee your understanding	10	12	U	_	O	O		1.00	/1311	1.00	1.00	3.03	3.05	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	6	3	4	3.47	1178/1490	3.47	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	3	5	2	2	2.80	1439/1502	2.80	4.18	4.26	4.46	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1266/1489	3.54	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	16	13	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.84	4.00	4.11	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	128/ 226	4.23	4.08	4.20	4.47	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	60/ 233	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.41	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	-	4.92	43/ 225		4.72	4.50		4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	148/ 223		4.51	4.35	4.48	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	3	0	0	1	2	o 7	4.23	63/ 206		4.69	4.15	4.40	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	U	U	Т	4	,	4.60	03/ 200	4.00	4.09	4.15	4.39	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4 67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.53	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30		0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****		4.90	****
	29	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 40	****	****	4.39	4.31	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	∠9	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	40			3.9/	4.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****

Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I

Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 31

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1459 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

nt: 32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	4	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1460 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	auer	cies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	16	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1669	4.87	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	268/1666	4.73	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	554/1617	4.47	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	141/1555	4.80	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	0	1	0	4		4.53	446/1647	4.53		4.12	4.15	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	4	7			1210/1605	4.23	3.94			4.23
		-	-	•	=		_		,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	861/1514	4.73	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	2	7	5		1354/1551	4.61	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	2	5	5		1030/1503	4.41		4.24	4.22	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	3	3	6		1038/1506	4.51	4.23	4.26		4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	552/1311	4.08		3.85	3.89	4.08
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	U	U	1	4	1	,	4.00	332/1311	4.00	4.00	3.03	3.09	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	6	3	4	2 47	1178/1490	3.47	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	3	5	2	2		1439/1502	2.80	4.18	4.26	4.46	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0		1	3	2	5							3.54
<u> </u>	18 16	13	2	0	0	2	0		1266/1489 ****/1006	3.54 ****	4.22	4.29	4.44	3.5 <del>4</del> ****
4. Were special techniques successful	Τ0	13	U	U	U	2	U	4.00	***/1006		3.84	4.00	4.11	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	128/ 226	4.23	4.08	4.20	4.47	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.23	60/ 233	4.69		4.20		4.69
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1	0	0	0	1		4.92		4.09	4.50		4.41 4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17								43/ 225			4.50		4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	148/ 223	4.23	4.51	4.35	4.48	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	3	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	63/ 206	4.60	4.69	4.15	4.39	4.60
Cominan														
Seminar	0.0	0	^	0	^	0	2	F 00	<b>4444/110</b>	****	1 00	4 20	4 20	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	2	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 112	****	4.06	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97		3.56	4.36	4.38	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.06	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****
Field Work				•			_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****

DATA ANALYTIC PROC I

Title Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 31

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 1460 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	4	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

#### Course Section: PSYC 620 0101 University of Maryland Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1461

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	1		1295/1647	3.71	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	320/1605	4.57	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Ο	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	729/1502	4.43	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	2		1038/1489	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1006	4.71	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.71

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

Course Section: PSYC 623 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1462

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN II
Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR

Enrollment: 10
Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 1 1 2 1 2.86 1623/1669 2.86 4.22 4.23 4.35 2.86 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 2 2 1 3.14 1561/1666 3.14 4.13 4.19 4.19 3.14 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 1 1 0 2 3.75 1135/1421 3.75 4.15 4.24 4.33 3.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 0 2 3 3.86 1196/1617 3.86 4.15 4.24 3.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 2 2 3.71 1095/1555 3.71 4.05 4.00 4.07 3.71 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 2 2 1 3.29 1336/1543 3.29 4.00 4.06 4.27 3.29 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 2 0 1 1 2.29 1603/1647 2.29 4.15 4.12 4.15 2.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.77 4.67 4.83 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 1400/1605 3.40 3.94 4.07 4.13 3.40 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 1375/1514 3.57 4.35 4.39 4.37 3.57 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 1135/1551 4.57 4.66 4.66 4.72 4.57 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 3 0 2 2 3.43 1358/1503 3.43 4.18 4.24 4.22 3.43 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 1 2 1 3.00 1403/1506 3.00 4.23 4.26 4.24 3.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 2 2 0 2 3.00 1115/1311 3.00 4.08 3.85 3.89 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 3.00 1328/1490 3.00 3.87 4.05 4.18 3.00 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 2 2 2 3.71 1231/1502 3.71 4.18 4.26 4.46 3.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 622/1489 4.57 4.22 4.29 4.44 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 2 2 0 2 3.33 841/1006 3.33 3.84 4.00 4.11 3.33 Seminar 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 112 \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.38 4.39 \*\*\*\* 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 97 \*\*\*\* 3.56 4.36 4.38 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 1 Ω 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 3.63 4.22 4.36 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 105 \*\*\*\* 4.06 4.20 4.23 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 98 \*\*\*\* 3.39 3.95 3.93 \*\*\*\* 6 0 1

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

Course Section: PSYC 636 0101 University of Maryla Title PRIMARY PREVENTION Baltimore County Instructor: REINKE, WENDY Fall 2006

Р

I

?

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

University of Maryland Page 1463
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Question	nnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	--------

							_	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.14
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6	0		1273/1666	3.86	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.86
		estions reflec	_	_	1	5	0	0	1	0	0		****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	6	0		1196/1617	3.86	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.86
			-	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4		418/1555		4.05	4.00	4.07	4.43
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	0		1236/1543	3.57	4.00	4.06	4.27	3.57
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	4			4.57	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.57
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
	_			ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1241/1605	3.71	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.71
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	e instru	actor's lecture	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.00
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.71
3. Was lec	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly								3	2	2	3.86	1189/1503	3.86	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.86
4. Did the	you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1403/1506	3.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.00			
5. Did aud	liovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.89	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	778/1490	4.14	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.14
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.86
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.57
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.00
1 77		Semina			_	0	_	0	^	1	_	4 00	<b>4444/110</b>	****	1 00	4 20	4 20	****
	_	_		announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112 ****/ 105	****	4.06	4.38	4.39	****
		ons contribute For grading mad		you learned	6 6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	4.06	4.20 3.95	3.93	****
5. were cr	ileria i	or grading mad	e crear		О	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	***/ 98		3.39	3.95	3.93	
				Frequ	ency.	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	:			Туј	pe			Majors				
		Cum. GPA																
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	1	Graduate	е	6	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	neral	_				3	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	7
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad.		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h				

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: PSYC 655 0101 Title ADV TOP A BEHAV AN Instructor: KAHNG, SUNG W Fall 2006

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

Page 1464 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionn	aire
Deadcire	COULDC	DVGTGGCTOII	Queberonni	urr c

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	0	2	8	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	103/1666	4.90	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2		****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	114/1617	4.90	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.05	4.00	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	226/1543	4.70	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7		1039/1668	4.70	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	3.94	4.07		4.67
or non-would fou grade one everall educating effectiveness	•	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	-	1.07	2337 2003	1.07	3.71	1.07	1.15	1.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1311	****	4.08	3.85	3.89	****
Discussion	•	0	_	0	•	0	1.0	F 00	1 /1 400	F 00	2 0 1	4 05	4 10	F 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.87	4.05	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0 1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful			U	U	U	0	4	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	5.00
Freq	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Frequency Distribution														

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1465 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15		
Questionnaires:	15	Student Course Evaluation Ques	tionnaire

Course Section: PSYC 695A 0101

FAMILY THERAPY

SCHAEFFER, CYNT

Title

Instructor:

			Fre	במוופי	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	
General	0	0	0	0	0	_	1 2	4 07	150/1660	4.87	4 00	4 00	4 25	4 07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13 9	4.87	159/1669 439/1666	4.87	4.22	4.23 4.19	4.35 4.19	4.87 4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	316/1555	4.53	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	195/1543	4.73	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	851/1647	4.27	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	350/1605	4.53	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.53
Lecture	_			_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	861/1514		4.35	4.39	4.37	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.87	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	300/1503	4.73	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	212/1506	4.87	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	428/1490	4.54	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	224/1489	4.92	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	88/1006	4.92	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	44/ 112	4.86	4.06	4.38	4.39	4.86
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	3.63	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 105	4.80	4.06	4.20	4.23	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	3.39	3.95	3.93	4.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ıtioı	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	5	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-		_	
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2006

Course Section: PSYC 695B 0101

14

SOCIAL HEALTH

BEDIAKO, SHAWN

Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

4. Were special techniques successful

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 14

Page 1466 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

4 3.82 998/1490 3.82 3.87 4.05 4.18 3.82

7 4.45 693/1502 4.45 4.18 4.26 4.46 4.45

6 4.27 909/1489 4.27 4.22 4.29 4.44 4.27

3 3 4.13 447/1006 4.13 3.84 4.00 4.11 4.13

	Ouestions NR						s Instruc		ructor Course Dep		Dept	ept 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	3	4	4	1	3.08	1591/1669	3.08	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	6	1	1	2.62	1630/1666	2.62	4.13	4.19	4.19	2.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	3	4	2	3.31	1336/1555	3.31	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	5	2	1	2.83	1476/1543	2.83	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	5	2	2	0	2.25	1607/1647	2.25	4.15	4.12	4.15	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	1444/1668	4.15	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	5	0	3.56	1334/1605	3.56	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1449/1514	3.10	4.35	4.39	4.37	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.66	4.66	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1366/1503	3.40	4.18	4.24	4.22	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	6	2	1	3.30	1368/1506	3.30	4.23	4.26	4.24	3.30

#### Frequency Distribution

3 3

0 0 1 1 3

3 0 0 0 2 2

3

Credits E	arned	ned Cum. GPA			l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: PSYC 695C 0101 University of Maryland Page 1467 ADDICTIONS Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 DICLEMENTE, CAR Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

13

Questions						NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 															
		Genera	l															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	500/1669	4.58	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.58
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.33
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.60
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	759/1543	4.17	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.17
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	343/1605	4.55	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.55
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	he instri	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	Λ	2	10	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.83
		ctor seem inter		_	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.75
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	249/1506		4.23	4.26	4.24	4.83
	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	0	3	- 8	4.73	158/1311		4.08	3.85		4.73
3. 21a aa	a10110aa1	. ccomingaco cin	iairoc 1	our undersounding	2	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü		Ü	11.75	130, 1311	1.,5	1.00	3.03	3.03	1.75
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ate to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.87	4.05	4.18	4.25
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.75
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		1	8	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.00
				Freq	nency	/ Dis	trib	ıtioı	า									
				1104	uciic,	DID	CI ID	20101										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 A 7		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	2	Graduat	 e	9	Majo	or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3						J						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					4	_		5			
				? 1														

Course Section: PSYC 715 0101 University
Title MEASUREMENT OF BEHAVIO Baltimo

Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 1468 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-	ncies	3			ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.22	4.23	4.35	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	425/1666	4.61	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1421	4.78	4.15	4.24	4.33	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	128/1617	4.88	4.15	4.15	4.24	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	5	6	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	316/1543	4.59	4.00	4.06	4.27	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.15	4.12	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	713/1605	4.24	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	742/1503	4.39	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1506	4.72	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	458/1311	4.24	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	956/1490	3.91	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	326/1502	4.82	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	742/1489	4.45	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	167/1006	4.70	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.08	4.20	4.47	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.50	4.19	4.41	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.72	4.50	4.65	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.51	4.35	4.48	****
Evaco	0000	. Diat	- m i bı	.+ : 0.	-									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	7	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 720 0101 University of Maryland Title INFANT ASSESSMENT Baltimore County Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER, Fall 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

6

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 1469

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionr	laire

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.35	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666		4.13	4.19	4.19	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421		4.15	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.15	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1555	4.67	4.05	4.00	4.07	4.67
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.00	4.06	4.27	5.00
7. Was th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.15	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.83	4.83
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	3.94	4.07	4.13	4.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.35	4.39	4.37	5.00
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.66	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.22	5.00
4. Did th	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.08	3.85	3.89	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.87	4.05	4.18	5.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.18	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did th	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.84	4.00	4.11	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	<b>:</b>
			· 															
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0									_		_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	L				4	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								•			,			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	e sign	uficar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					2						

Course Section: PSYC 741 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN BEH MED Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR Enrollment:

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Page 1470 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ο	0	0	3	5	5	6	3 74	1379/1669	3.74	4.22	4.23	4.35	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	3	6		1502/1666	3.42	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	2		****/1421	****	4.15	4.24	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	2	1	4		1184/1617	3.88	4.15	4.15	4.24	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	5	3	5		1272/1555	3.44	4.05	4.00	4.07	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	4	2	2	1	2		1510/1543	2.55	4.00	4.06	4.27	2.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	1	0	6	2	2	3.36	1459/1647	3.36	4.15	4.12	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	1	9	6	1	3.28	1449/1605	3.28	3.94	4.07	4.13	3.28
T a selection														
Lecture	_	0	0	0	4	4	_	4 00	1050/1514	4 00	4 25	4 20	4 27	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	9		1058/1514		4.35	4.39	4.37	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	<u> </u>	5 4	11 8	4.59	1127/1551 950/1503	4.59 4.18	4.66 4.18	4.66 4.24	4.72	4.59 4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.18			4.18	4.24		4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3 4	4	7	4.25	483/1311	4.25	4.23	3.85		4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	3	1	U	U	4	4	/	4.20	483/1311	4.20	4.08	3.85	3.89	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	5	4	3.47	1172/1490	3.47	3.87	4.05	4.18	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	0	1	2	12	4.29	852/1502	4.29	4.18	4.26	4.46	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	846/1489	4.35	4.22	4.29	4.44	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.84	4.00	4.11	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	79/ 112	4.23	4.06	4.38	4.39	4.23
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	10	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 97	****	3.56	4.36	4.38	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	58/ 105	4.36	4.06	4.20	4.23	4.36
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	10	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	,	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****
	Ü	_ 0	,	_	_	Ū	_	2.55	, ,		2.33			
_														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	0	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course Section: PSYC 781 0101 University of Maryland Title SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 12

Page 1471 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	}		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	1	0	4	4	1	1	1	2.18	1662/1669	2.18	4.22	4.23	4.35	2.18
		ctor make clear			1	0	4	3	3	1	0		1659/1666		4.13	4.19	4.19	2.09
		uestions reflect			1	8	0	1	1	1	0		1357/1423		4.15	4.24	4.33	3.00
		uations reflect			1	0	2	4	4	0	1	2.45	1595/1617	2.45	4.15	4.15	4.24	2.45
		eadings contribu			1	0	2	2	3	1	3		1414/155		4.05	4.00	4.07	3.09
				what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	3	1		1410/1543		4.00	4.06	4.27	3.00
		g system clearly			1	0	6	3	0	0	2		1619/1647			4.12	4.15	2.00
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	4			1096/1668		4.77	4.67	4.83	4.64
				ng effectiveness	3	0	3	3	2	1			1581/1609		3.94	4.07	4.13	2.11
		Lecture																
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures		repared	1	0	3	4	2	2	0	2 27	1493/1514	2 27	4.35	4.39	4.37	2.27
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	1	1	4	5		1364/1551		4.66	4.66	4.72	4.18
		terial presented			1	0	3	4	3	0			1480/1503		4.18	4.24	4.22	2.27
		es contribute to			1	0	4	3	2	1	1		1481/1506		4.23	4.26	4.24	2.27
		l techniques enh			2	1	1	2	3	1	_		1100/1311			3.85		3.11
5. Did au	.uiovisua.	r techniques enn	lance you	ir understanding	4	1	1	4	3	_	۷	3.11	1100/131.	3.11	4.00	3.05	3.09	3.11
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu			1	0	5	2	4	0	0		1478/1490			4.05	4.18	1.91
		nts actively enc			1	0	1	2	1	1	6		1172/1502		4.18	4.26	4.46	3.82
		ctor encourage f		open discussion	1	0	1	2	2	2			1262/1489		4.22	4.29		3.55
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succes	sful		1	1	3	3	0	2	2	2.70	960/1006	2.70	3.84	4.00	4.11	2.70
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	clear		11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	3.39	3.95	3.93	****
		Field W	lork															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribut	e to wha	ıt you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	ribu	utio	n									
a 1'. =		a ana						_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; · – – – -			 T.Z	/pe 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Graduat	e	5	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-	grad	7	Non-	-major	12
84-150														<del>-</del>				
Grad.	5	5 3.50-4.00 3 F 0				Electives						1	#### -	### - Means there are not enough			jh	
P 0													respons	ses to b	oe sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ıer					7						
				? 1														