tle INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 80
Ouestionnaires: 29

-

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1203

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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 1 9 15 4.28 818/1481 4.43 4.24 4.29 4.14 4.28 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 12 0 8 8 11 3.93 1082/1481 4.22 4.23 4.23 4.18 3.93 0 4 13 12 4.28 726/1249 4.21 4.32 4.27 4.14 4.28 1 0 10 5 4.19 818/1424 4.24 4.22 4.21 4.06 4.19 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 22 0 1 4 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1342 4.13 4.10 4.07 3.88 \*\*\*\* 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 1 4 8 15 4.32 707/1459 4.33 4.21 4.16 4.17 4.32 1 0 0 0 0 17 11 4.39 1120/1480 4.47 4.69 4.68 4.64 4.39 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 7 5 9 3.83 1038/1450 4.13 4.03 4.09 3.97 3.83 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω 3 9 16 4.38 924/1409 4.56 4.41 4.42 4.36 4.38 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 5 24 4.83 682/1407 4.82 4.68 4.69 4.57 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 3 11 13 4.29 801/1399 4.42 4.28 4.26 4.23 4.29 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 2 4 8 12 3.83 1113/1400 4.23 4.26 4.27 4.19 3.83 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 2 5 7 14 4.07 570/1179 4.25 3.95 3.96 3.85 4.07 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17 0 5 0 2.75 1196/1262 3.61 3.90 4.05 3.77 2.75 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17 3 6 4.17 836/1259 4.25 4.24 4.29 4.06 4.17 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 01 0 2 2 7 4.17 826/1256 4.38 4.30 4.30 4.08 4.17 4. Were special techniques successful 17 9 0 1 1 0 2.67 \*\*\*\*/ 788 3.52 3.89 4.00 3.80 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 26 0 1 1 3.67 \*\*\*\*/ 246 4.04 4.03 4.20 3.93 \*\*\*\* 0 2 1 4.33 \*\*\*\*/ 249 4.43 4.40 4.11 3.95 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0 Ω Ω 0 1 2 4.67 \*\*\*\*/ 242 4.52 4.36 4.40 4.33 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 1 1 3.67 \*\*\*\*/ 240 4.19 4.34 4.20 4.20 \*\*\*\* 26 0 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 26 1 0 0 2 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 217 4.22 3.89 4.04 4.02 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 68 \*\*\*\* 4.84 4.49 4.54 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 69 \*\*\*\* 4.74 4.53 4.18 \*\*\*\* 63 \*\*\*\* 4.66 4.44 4.17 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 27 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 69 \*\*\*\* 4.52 4.35 4.14 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 27 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 68 \*\*\*\* 4.04 3.92 3.80 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 27 0 1 0 0 1 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 59 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.30 4.00 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 27 0 1 0 2.50 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 3.00 4.00 3.44 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 36 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.60 5.00 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 27 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 3.50 4.26 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 0 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 27 0 1 1 0 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 31 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.42 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 4.11 4.11 4.55 4.48 \*\*\*\* 27 0 0 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 31 4.14 4.14 4.75 4.42 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 1 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 27 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 51 3.89 3.89 4.65 4.63 \*\*\*\*

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 27 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 34 3.82 3.82 4.83 4.67 \*\*\*\*

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 27 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/ 24 4.08 4.08 4.82 4.58 \*\*\*\*

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 80
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1203 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 154 Questionnaires: 58

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1204 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	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	4	0	0	1	6	13	34	4.48	574/1481	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.14	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	6	17	32	4.47	560/1481	4.22	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	3	3	20	27	4.28	726/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	20	0	1	6	11	17	4.26	740/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.06	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	1	4	10	35	4.51	297/1396	4.37	4.00	3.98	3.89	4.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	40	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	****/1342	4.13	4.10	4.07	3.88	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	7	12	32	4.35	671/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	1	51	4.94	421/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	0	6	27	13	4.02	825/1450	4.13	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.02
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	7	43	4.75	417/1409	4.56	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	6	44	4.74	842/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	15	34	4.55	523/1399	4.42	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	4	13	34	4.49	602/1400	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.19	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	4	11	38	4.59	213/1179	4.25	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.59
5. Dia addiovidual econniqued cimanoc your anderbeanding	-	J	Ü	_	-		50	1.55	213/11/5	1.23	3.75	3.70	3.03	1.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	3	3	4	6	15	3.87	816/1262	3.61	3.90	4.05	3.77	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	3	5	6	20	4.17	831/1259	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.06	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	1	3	5	23	4.45	625/1256	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.08	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	23	23	2	1	4	1	4		****/ 788		3.89	4.00	3.80	****
1. Were special techniques successful	23	23	2	_	1	_	1	3.33	, , , , ,	3.32	3.05	1.00	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	2	1	10	13	15	3.93	175/ 246	4.04	4.03	4.20	3.93	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	6	13	25	4.43	94/ 249	4.43	4.40	4.11	3.95	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	11	0	0	5	4	23	4.56	104/ 242	4.52	4.36	4.40	4.33	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	24	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	145/ 242	4.19		4.20	4.20	4.28
-		25	0	0	5	-	8		- ,		4.34			
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	25	U	U	5	4	8	4.18	116/ 217	4.22	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.18
Seminar														
	53	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	1 0 1	4 40	4 54	++++
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		5 5	0		0	0	_		, 00	****	4.84	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52			1			0	2.00	,		4.74	4.53	4.18	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work					_				= 0			4 00		****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	3	7	14	14	4.03	43/ 55	4.11	4.11	4.55	4.48	4.03
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	3	1	0	7	12	12	4.06	28/ 31	4.14	4.14	4.75	4.42	4.06
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	6	0	1	13	6	9	3.79	46/ 51	3.89	3.89	4.65	4.63	3.79
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	21	0	1	6	2	4		****/ 34	3.82	3.82	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	20	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	21/ 24	4.08	4.08	4.82	4.58	4.33

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 154
Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1204 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	Α	15	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	2	В	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	11	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	12	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	3						

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 141 Questionnaires: 100

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1205 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
******														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	9	29	61	4.53	531/1481	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.14	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	12	31	50	4.25	822/1481	4.22	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	24	27	43	4.09	857/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	32	2	2	6	22	35	4.28	706/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.06	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	10	27	56	4.43	355/1396	4.37	4.00	3.98	3.89	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	59	0	3	6	12	17	4.13	660/1342	4.13	4.10	4.07	3.88	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	6	13	24	56	4.31	719/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	5	77	15	4.08	1329/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	43	55	4.53	311/1450	4.13	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	7	29	62	4.54	727/1409	4.56	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	6	89	4.88	568/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	12	30	55	4.42	671/1399	4.42	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	12	23	58	4.38	729/1400	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.19	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	2	3	16	30	36	4.09	560/1179	4.25	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	0	11	23	31	4.21	603/1262	3.61	3.90	4.05	3.77	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	1	8	17	40	4.40	680/1259	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.06	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	0	7	15	44	4.51	571/1256	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.08	4.51
4. Were special techniques successful	33	34	5	3	7	6	12	3.52	602/ 788	3.52	3.89	4.00	3.80	3.52
T . D b														
Laboratory	1 2	0	2	2	1 1	0.4	4.2	1 10	140/046	4 0 4	4 02	4 00	2 02	4 16
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	3	3	14	24	43	4.16	142/ 246		4.03	4.20	3.93	4.16
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	1 2	3	9 10	16 8	54 50	4.43	94/ 249	4.43 4.52	4.40	4.11	3.95	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17 18	13 31	3	3	8	9	28	4.49	119/ 242 158/ 240	4.52	4.36	4.40 4.20	4.33	4.49
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	31 34	3 1	2	9	9 7	28 29	4.10	103/ 217		4.34	4.20	4.20	4.10 4.27
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	10	34		4	2	,	49	4.2/	103/ 21/	4.22	3.09	4.04	4.02	4.4/
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	92	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	93	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	93	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	93	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	90	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	91	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	91	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	91	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	1		25	44	4.20	42/ 55		4.11	4.55	4.48	4.20
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	8	1	2	12	25	36	4.22	26/ 31	4.14	4.14	4.75	4.42	4.22
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	25	3	1	12	21	22	3.98	43/ 51	3.89	3.89	4.65	4.63	3.98
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	34	4	4	9	12	20	3.82	33/ 34		3.82	4.83	4.67	3.82
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	36	4	3	9	12	19	3.83	23/ 24	4.08	4.08	4.82	4.58	3.83

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 141
Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1205 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	3	В	35						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	14	С	14	General	16	Under-grad	100	Non-major	99
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	2			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	4						

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: KATENKAMP, ANGE

Enrollment: 85
Questionnaires: 42

ENKAMP, ANGE Spring 2006

Page 1206 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			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	0	^	0	_	10	0.4	1 10	600/1401	4 40	4 0 4	4 00	4 40	1 10
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	12	24	4.46	600/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	28	4.66	336/1481	4.56	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	-	-	0	2	12	26	4.60	405/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	4	10	20	4.47	473/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	2	6	11	12	3.71	950/1396		4.00	3.98	3.94	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	9	./	18	4.08	707/1342	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	9	28	4.54	425/1459	4.64	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	36	4.90	702/1480	4.66	4.69	4.68		4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	15	16	4.38	494/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	483/1409	4.79	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	682/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69		4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	311/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	31	4.77	299/1400		4.26	4.27		4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	7	28	4.59	218/1179		3.95	3.96		4.59
J. Did additional techniques childree your anderstanding	,	O	U	_	J	,	20	1.55	210/11/2	1.33	3.75	3.50	1.05	1.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	638/1262	3.84	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	7	3	9	4.11	867/1259	4.01	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	766/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	23	9	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	****/ 788	3.54	3.89	4.00	3.98	****
0.16 70 1														
Self Paced							_	4 = 0	==					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.50	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	Τ	1		****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.66	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	5.00	***

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	 А	29	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	42	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201 Title

CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID

Enrollment: 80 Questionnaires: 41

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1207 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation	Questi	ionna:	ire
---------------------------	--------	--------	-----

			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	2	0	0	1	3	8	27	4.56	496/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	13	24	4.61	399/1481	4.56	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	11	22	4.38	639/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	2	1	7	7	3.94	1035/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.28	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	7	28	4.63	217/1396	4.15	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	****/1342	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.05	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	7	30	4.69	242/1459	4.64	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	784/1480	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	21	10	4.21	683/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	30	4.76	400/1409	4.79	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	636/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	8	27	4.63	417/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	8	25	4.53	571/1400	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	7	29	4.76	134/1179	4.55	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	10	3	10	3.80	862/1262	3.84	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	3	7	12	4.04	883/1259	4.01	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	4	2	18	4.48	592/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	16	12	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	598/ 788	3.54	3.89	4.00	3.98	3.54

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	41	Non-major	33
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	19	_			
				?	0						

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: BEVANS, KATHERI

Enrollment: 63

Questionnaires: 22

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1208 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			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 insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	_	۵	4.44	639/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	646/1481	4.56	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	6	0	4.24	757/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	1	2	4	٥	4.31	671/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	633/1396	4.15	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	2	9	4	4.12	755/1342	4.13	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	231/1459	4.64	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	13	4			4.66	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	n	0	2	± 5	5	4.23	651/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.23
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		O	U	U		O	5	1.25	031/1130	1.27	1.05	1.00	1.13	1.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	231/1409	4.79	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	823/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	431/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	468/1400	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	397/1179	4.55	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.31
** *******************************														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	976/1262	3.84	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	987/1259	4.01	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	357/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 788	3.54	3.89	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	0						

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA

Enrollment: 73

Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1209 JUN 13, 2006 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	2	0	1	1	7	13	8	3 87	1187/1481	4.19	4.24	4.29	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	10	13	4.17	909/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	11		4.33	679/1249		4.32	4.27	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	2	3	6	8		1181/1424		4.22	4.21	4.28	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	Ó	1	3	3	12	11	3.97	744/1396		4.00	3.98	3.94	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	891/1342		4.10	4.07	4.05	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	6	7	15	4.13	881/1459	4.48	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1480	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	6	9	6	3.83	1038/1450	4.12	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	750/1409	4.67	4.41	4 42	4.47	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	200/1407	4.94		4.69	4.78	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	5	15	8		1110/1399		4.28	4.26	4.29	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	6	7	14		1017/1400		4.26	4.27	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	10	6	11		739/1179		3.95	3.96	4.05	
Diamondo.														
Discussion	1 4	0	0	4	-	2	4	2 20	1041/1060	2 72	2 00	4 05	4 11	2 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	4	1	3	4		1041/1262		3.90	4.05	4.11	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14 14	0	0	2 1	4 8	6 6	6	3.89	987/1259 1081/1256	4.15 4.08	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	1	2	8	0	3 1		****/ 788		3.89	4.30	3.98	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	1	2	3	U	1	2./1	/ /00		3.09	4.00	3.90	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	Λ	0	1	Λ	Λ	3 00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31		4.11	4.75	4.50	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-	•	_	
				2	Λ						

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

Instructor: RICHMAN, DAVID

Enrollment: 82
Questionnaires: 42

ICHMAN, DAVID Spring 2006 82 Page 1210 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions			Fre	equer	ncie	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	1	0	0	2	3	8	28	4.51	540/1481	4.19	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9	31	4.71	274/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	29	4.59	423/1249	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	773/1424	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	2	6	9	15	3.53	1071/1396	3.75	4.00	3.98	3.94	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	35	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1342	3.89	4.10	4.07	4.05	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	36	4.83	149/1459	4.48	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	16	4.39	1120/1480	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	16	18	4.42	459/1450	4.12	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	35	4.83	304/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	38	4.90	500/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	33	4.68	349/1399	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	36	4.83	229/1400	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	4	4	7	20	4.14	533/1179	3.99	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	684/1262	3.73	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	3	3	19	4.41	680/1259	4.15	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	543/1256	4.08	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	15	18	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.98	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	4.69	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.50	****
Freque			trib	utior	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	42	Non-major	15
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	30	-	-		
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 230 0101 University of Maryland Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE Baltimore County Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 1211

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	51	
Questionnaires:	33	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	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 vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	1	1	3	12	16	4.24	857/1481	4.24	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.24
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.45
		uestions reflec			1	0	1	0	4	7	20	4.41	624/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.41
	_	uations reflect		_	1	2	1	0	6	8	15	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.20
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	2	3	8	6	13	3.78	893/1396	3.78	4.00	3.98	3.94	3.78
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	11	12	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	425/1459	4.53	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.53
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.97
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	16	10	4.17	712/1450	4.17	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.17
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.83
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.87
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl				3	0	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	335/1399	4.70	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.70
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				3	0	1	0	2	3	24	4.63	456/1400	4.63	4.26	4.27		4.63
				our understanding	4	0	0	0	4	4		4.59	218/1179		3.95	3.96		4.59
1 5 1 1		Discus			1.4	0	0	0	2	_	1.0	4 50	225/1060	4 50	2 00	4 05	4 11	4 50
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	335/1262		3.90	4.05	4.11	4.53
		_	_	d to participate	15	0	0	0	0 1		17					4.29	4.34	
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	14 14	0	0	1	1		18 10	4.89 4.44	224/1256 205/ 788		4.30	4.30	4.28	4.89 4.44
1. Were b	pecial c	comingues succe	DDIGI			3	Ü	-	_	•	10	1.11	2037 700	1.11	3.05	1.00	3.70	
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 14					Red	auir	ed fo	or M	 aior	s 1	.0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo		16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 14						,	-	-		-		) 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 3	32	Non-	major	17
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	D 0													-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	it	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.7						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101 Title

ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: RESTA, PETER

Enrollment: 80 Questionnaires: 32

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1212 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	0	1	5	26	4.78	256/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	299/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	178/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	364/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	8	18	4.28	476/1396	4.18	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	9	12	4.00	755/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	264/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	281/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	296/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	433/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	350/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	322/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	146/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6	24	4.71	157/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	855/1262	3.68	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	708/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	549/1256	4.26	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	21	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	3.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	А	26	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	32	Non-major	27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201 University of Maryland Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: JORDAN, LISA Enrollment: 67

Questionnaires: 32

Page 1213 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	_			
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$

	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	1	0	0	3	3	13	12	4.10	1012/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	11	10	3.97	1047/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	11	11	3.97	927/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	2	14	10	4.03	943/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	11	13	4.17	584/1396	4.18	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	12	13	4.13	672/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	490/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	6	14	4	3.73	1115/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	6	2.0	4.52	750/1409	4.67	4 41	4.42	4.47	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	9	15		1260/1407		4.68	4.69	4.78	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	13	11	4.17	901/1399		4.28	4.26	4.29	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	716/1400		4.26	4.27		4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	5	8	14	4.17	503/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	3	4	4	3	3.50	,		3.90	4.05	4.11	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17 17	0	1	1	5	3	5		1067/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	1	3	6	5	4.00	901/1256		4.30	4.30	4.28	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	631/ 788	3.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	3.44
Post of		D												

Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301

ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Title Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO

Enrollment: 77 Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 1214 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Overtions					equei		s .	_		ructor		Dept			Sect		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	6	13	22	4.39	688/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.39
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	1	4	15	21	4.37	704/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.37
		uestions reflect the e		1	0	0	1	4	13	23	4.41	611/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.41
		uations reflect the ex		1	33	0	0	1	3	4		****/1424		4.22	4.21	4.28	****
	_	eadings contribute to	-	1	2	4	2	5	12	16	3.87	823/1396		4.00	3.98	3.94	3.87
		signments contribute t		1	37	0	0	0	1	3		****/1342		4.10	4.07	4.05	****
	-	g system clearly expla	ined	1	0	0	0	5	9	27	4.54	425/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.54
	-	was class cancelled	ni	1	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	211/1480		4.69	4.68	4.68	4.98
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall teac	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	U	4	17	13	4.26	620/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.26
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well :	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	32	4.73	450/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.73
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem interested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	400/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.93
		terial presented and e		2	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	335/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.70
		es contribute to what		1	0 5	0	1	2	13	25	4.51	581/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.51
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	2	5	10	19	4.28	426/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.28
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	l. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					3	1	5	6	5	3.45	1014/1262	3.68	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.45
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	2	1	4	5	8		1027/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.80
		ctor encourage fair an		22 22	0	2	0	3	5	10	4.05	880/1256		4.30	4.30	4.28	4.05
		echniques successful		22	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788		3.89	4.00	3.98	***
		- 1															
מש בים ו	a lab da	Laboratory	£ +b1	2.0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	++++	4.03	4 00	<i>1</i> F1	++++
		crease understanding o ded with adequate back		38 41	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 249	****	4.40	4.20 4.11	4.51 4.32	****
Z. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequate back	ground information	41	U	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 249		4.40	4.11	4.32	
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	leld expe	rience contribute to w	hat you learned	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****
		Self Paced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****
1. 210 20	JII PAOCA		mide you rearried		Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 33			1.55		
			Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Major				 g 1	7	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	12		
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 16	Required for Majors					. I	. ,	Graduat	_	J	ria ju	-	12	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 10	C 7	General					4	Under-g	rad 4	2	Non-	major	30		
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 12	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives							2	#### - 1		here a		enoug	ıh

Other

16

0

0

2

Ι

?

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: RESTA, PETER

Enrollment: 63

Questionnaires: 48

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1215 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	6	0	0	1	2	7	32	4.67	395/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	5	11	27	4.51	505/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	10	30	4.64	357/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	5	1	0	6	9	21	4.32	658/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	6	9	25	4.39	387/1396	4.18	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	9	26	4.41	394/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	1	6	32	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	743/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	6	10	18	4.35	525/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.35
Lecture	0	0	0	-	-	0	2.0	4 60	E 4 4 / 1 4 0 0	4 60	4 41	4 40	4 45	4 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	8	30	4.68	544/1409	4.67		4.42	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	150/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	3	6	31	4.55	523/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	3	34	4.68	397/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	104/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	770/1262	3.68	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	3	1	2	2	9		1039/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	647/1256	4.26	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	32	7	1	0	1	1	6		****/ 788	3.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.55	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	40	_	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 00		1.01	3.92	3.33	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: RESTA, PETER

Enrollment: 63
Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1215 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	48	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 305 0101 University of Maryland Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1216

Enrollment:	140	0			
uestionnaires:	76	6 Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest

? 0

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	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 n	ew insights,sk		om this course	5	0	0	4	11	23	33	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.20
_	_	ctor make clea:			5	0	2	3	11	22	33	4.14	925/1481	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.14
		uestions refle			5	0	1	4	11	18	37	4.21	773/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.21
	_	uations reflect		_	6	15	1	4	12	15	23	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.00
				what you learned	7	0	0	4	9	18	38	4.30	459/1396	4.30	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.30
	_	_		to what you learned	7	28	0	1	11	9	20	4.17	615/1342	4.17	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.17
		g system clear:		_	7	0	0	4	11	10	44	4.36	659/1459	4.36	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.36
		was class can			7	0	0	0	0	5	64	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.93
	-			ching effectiveness	20	0	3	2	15	21	15		1089/1450		4.03	4.09		3.77
	-	J		3														
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	6	0	1	0	5	16	48	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.57
2. Did th	he instru	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	4	6	60	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.80
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						2	2	10	15	39	4.28	810/1399	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	3	2	6	14	44	4.36	754/1400	4.36	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.36
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	1	1	8	12	42	4.45	299/1179	4.45	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.45
1 544		Discus			0.4	0	2	2	^	1 1	0.0	2 00	705 /1060	2 00	2 00	4 05	4 1 4	2 00
				what you learned	24	0	3	3	9	14	23	3.98	725/1262		3.90	4.05	4.14	
				ed to participate	24	0	0	1	6	6	39	4.60	516/1259	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.60
		_		nd open discussion	24	0	1	1	10	9	34	4.42	658/1256	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.34	
4. Were s	special t	echniques succ	essiul		24	2	Τ	2	12	10	25	4.12	358/ 788	4.12	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.12
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	Δ	Expected Grades				Re	eason	ıs			Ту	ne			Majors	
			. <u>.</u> 							 								
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 26	Required for Majors 10			Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	34					
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	в 32														
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	19	C 7	General 22			22	Under-g	rad 7	6	Non-	major	42				
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	12	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				2	29						

Course-Section: PSYC 306 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVELOP

Spring 2006

Page 1217

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN Enrollment: 59

Questionnaires: 48

					-				ructor	Course	_							
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	8	16	24	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	3	15	27	4.38	693/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.38
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	2	2	8	9	27	4.19	795/1249	4.19	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.19
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	3	0	3	2	18	22	4.31	671/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.31
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrik	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	11	32	4.54	274/1396	4.54	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.54
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	19	20	4.08	707/1342	4.08	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.08
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	12	32	4.56	390/1459	4.56	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.56
8. How m	any times	was class cand	celled		0	1	0	0	0	33	14	4.30	1185/1480	4.30	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.30
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	all teac	hing effectiveness	5	3	0	0	4	26	10	4.15	732/1450	4.15	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.15
		Lectur																
1 Word	the instr	uctor's lecture		propored	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.89	202/1409	4.89	1 11	1 12	4.43	1 00
					1	-	0	0	2	-		4.85			4.68	4.69	4.67	
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>						0	0	2	9		4.72			4.28	4.26		4.72
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	0		10		4.65	,				4.28	
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1 0	0	2	3	9		4.54	,					
J. DIG A	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					U	U	2	5	,	22	1.51	230/11/9	1.51	3.93	3.90	1.02	1.51
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	28	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	610/1262	4.20	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.20
2. Were	all stude	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	28	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	461/1259	4.65	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.65
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	428/1256		4.30	4.30	4.34	4.70
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	essful		28	7	0	3	0	3	7	4.08	377/ 788	4.08	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.08
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_	_													
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	<u> </u>	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 22					Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	1	в 16	Required for haj					-						_		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General					5	Under-g	rad 4	:8	Non-	major	46		
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	14	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0					responses to be sign			e sign	ifican	ıt				
				I 0		Otl	her				3	6						
				? 1														

PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING

Title

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 125 Questionnaires: 36

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1218 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cie	S		Inst	ructor	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	2	0	0	1	3	7	23	4.53	531/1481	4.53	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	24	4.54	469/1481	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	10	21	4.47	535/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	19	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	364/1424	4.57	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	12	19	4.47	321/1396	4.47	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	28	0	0	0	2	3		****/1342	****	4.10	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	3		4.53	436/1459	4.53	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	15	18		1044/1480	4.50	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	11	13		557/1450	4.32	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	U	U	U	4	TT	13	4.32	55//1450	4.32	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	28	4.76	400/1409	4.76	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	150/1407	4.70	4.68	4.69	4.43	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	27	4.68	363/1399	4.68	4.08	4.26	4.07	4.68
	2	0	0	1	2	5		4.65		4.65			4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							26		444/1400		4.26	4.27		4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	248/1179	4.53	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.53
Discussion	10	0		•	2	_	_	2 50	015/1060	2 50	2 00	4 05	4 1 4	2 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	0	3	8	8	3.70	917/1262	3.70	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	5	9	8	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	686/1256	4.39	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	686/ 788	3.27	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	3.96	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 125
Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1218 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	36	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	2			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101 University of Maryland Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE Spring 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor

Frequencies

Page 1219

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	42			
Questionnaires:	24	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

									-quc		~		2110	CIUCCOI	CCALDC	- Lepe	CLIDC		2200
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1. I	oid vou	ı gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	1	0	2	0	9	6	6	3.61	1324/1481	3.61	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.61
					xpected goals			1	4	4	6			1237/1481		4.23		4.23	3.70
			uestions reflec				0			3	9			1113/1249			4.27	4.28	3.52
		_	uations reflect		_		0	1	1	10	8	3	3.48	1281/1424	3.48	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.48
					what you learned	2		2	2	7				1083/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	3.50
6. I	Did wri	itten as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	2	0	1	3	7	8			1166/1342		4.10	4.07	4.12	3.41
7. V	Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	0	3		8		3	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.00
		_	was class cance			2		0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.95
					ching effectiveness	3		2	1	8	8	1	3.25	1307/1450	3.25	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.25
			Lectur	_															
1 τ	Jara th	na inatr	uctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	1	0	0	11	a	4 20	1013/1409	4 20	4.41	4 42	4 43	4 20
			ctor seem inter			3								1194/1407		4.68			
					explained clearly									1196/1399		4.28			
			es contribute t				0	1	3	5	6	6	3 62	1200/1300	3.62				
					your understanding	4		2	0	5				846/1179					
J. 1	Jia aac	11011544	r ccciniiqueb en	ilanice .	your understanding	-	3	_	Ü	3	3	5	3.03	010/11/5	3.03	3.75	3.70	1.02	3.03
			Discus	sion															
1. I	Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	16	0	2	0					949/1262		3.90	4.05	4.14	3.63
2. V	Were al	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	16	0	1						1043/1259		4.24	4.29	4.34	3.75
3. I	Did the	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair a	nd open discussion		0	1				3	3.75	1042/1256	3.75	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.75
4. V	Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		16	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 788	***	3.89	4.00	4.07	****
					Frequ	iencs	, Dis	trib	ıt i o	m									
					1104	aciic j	DID	CIID	uc10										
Cred	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-	 -27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	r r	15
28-	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			-			-						3 -		
56-	-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 5		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	9
84-	-150		3.00-3.49		D 1									3				-	
Gra	ad.	0		2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
					I 0		Ot	her				1	7	_					
					? 1														

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101
Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME

Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME Instructor: MARTINKOWSKI, K

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 31

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1220 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			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	1	2	2	9	16	4.23	870/1481	4.23	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	422/1481	4.59	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	22	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	454/1342	4.35	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	231/1459	4.71	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	491/1480	4.93	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	10	15	4.34	536/1450	4.34	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	400/1409	4.77	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	5	19	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	1	3	8	10	3.96	641/1179	3.96	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	8	3	11	3.69	917/1262	3.69	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	701/1259	4.37	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	543/1256	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	3
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_			
				?	2						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor:

DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1221 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	896/1481		4.24	4.29	4.29	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	85/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	406/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	9	6	4.06	808/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	682/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	10		1232/1407		4.68	4.69	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	723/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	-		4.47			4.26	4.27	4.28	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	218/1179		3.95	3.96		
5. Did audiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	U	2	U	U	2	3	12	4.59	218/11/9	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	797/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	978/1259		4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242		4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240		4.34	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 217		3.89	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar	1.0	0	_	_	0	-	0	4 00		de de de de	4 0 4	4 40	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 68	***	4.84	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	U	0	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****
1 State of the state of t		Ū	ŭ	ŭ	•	ŭ	-	3.00	, 21		2.00	1.02	,	

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 38

Title

ANTY, JANI (Instr. A) Spring 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1221 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

PSIC 331 0101

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 19

Title

# Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1222 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	896/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	85/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	406/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	836/1450	4.01		4.09		3.85
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27		4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	
5. Did additivibual econniques chiance your anderstanding		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_	1.50	, 11, 5	1.33	3.75	3.70	1.02	1.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	797/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	978/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	- ,		3.89	4.00	4.07	
1. Were special techniques successful	O	5	_	_	_	_	2	3.33	0717 700	3.70	3.05	1.00	1.07	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	3.89	4.20	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	10	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 21/		3.03	4.04	4.11	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****		4.53	4.66	****
z. was the instructor available for individual accontion	10	0	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 05		1.,1	1.55	1.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	/ 51		3.00	1.00	1.13	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****
J. Here energy enough procedus for all the students	10	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 24		1.00	1.02	1.0/	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101 Title

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 19 Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1222 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Title

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Instructor:

Enrollment:

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1223 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	38			
Questionnaires:	19	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	cies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	896/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	85/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	406/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1223/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1179			3.96	4.02	4.59
1,									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	797/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	978/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	671/ 788		3.89	4.00		3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****		4.04	4.11	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****		4.82	4.67	****
									,					

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101 University of Maryland Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 38 Spring 2006

Page 1223 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 85 Questionnaires: 34

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1224 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equer	cies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
ζ	uestions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new insid		n this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	24	4.53	531/1481	4 32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.53
2. Did the instructor mak			0	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	219/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.76
3. Did the exam questions			1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	178/1249		4.32	4.27	4.28	4.85
4. Did other evaluations		_	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	157/1424		4.22	4.21	4.27	4.85
5. Did assigned readings			0	2	2	0	4	4	22	4.38	403/1396			3.98	4.00	4.38
6. Did written assignment			0	3	1	1	3	7	19	4.35	454/1342		4.10	4.07	4.12	4.35
7. Was the grading system			0	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	- , -		4.21	4.16	4.17	4.74
8. How many times was cla		inea	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	896/1480			4.68	4.65	4.74
9. How would you grade th		ning effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	9		4.65	231/1450			4.09	4.10	
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's		orepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	32	4.91	169/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor see			0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97			4.68	4.69	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material p			0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	195/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contr			0	1	0	0	1	1	31		146/1400			4.27	4.28	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techni	-		0	3	1	0	2	10		4.42			3.95	3.96		4.42
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussions		what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	8	13	4.12	666/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.12
2. Were all students acti			8	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	422/1259		4.24	4.29		4.69
3. Did the instructor end			8	0	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	614/1256		4.30	4.30		4.46
4. Were special technique	-		8	5	2	0	4	3		4.10	372/ 788		3.89	4.00	4.07	
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase w	_	f the material	22	0	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	178/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	3.92
2. Were you provided with			22	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	99/ 249			4.11	4.23	4.42
3. Were necessary materia			22	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	152/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor			22	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	137/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.33
5. Were requirements for	-		22	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 217	****		4.04	4.11	***
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system	contribute to v	what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	***	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned C	um. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	ne			Majors	ł
	-0.99 0	A 20		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	22
	-1.99 0	в 6														
	-2.99 9	C 5		Ger	nera:	l				2	Under-g	rad 3	34	Non-	-major	12
	-3.49 10	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50	-4.00 3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ſh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

30

I 0

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 85 Questionnaires: 34

Spring 2006

Page 1225 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

				Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	S	
		Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	M
		General														
. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	24	4.53	531/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4
		tor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	219/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4
		nestions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4
. Did o	ther evalu	nations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	157/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4
		eadings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	4	22	4.38	403/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	4
		signments contribute to what you learne	d 0	3	1	1	3	7	19	4.35	454/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4
		system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	210/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4
		was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	896/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	
		grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 20	2	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1285/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4
		Lecture														
Were	the instru	ctor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1245/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	
		ctor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	1	3	3	1		1387/1407		4.68	4.69	4.67	
		cerial presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	2	1	2			****/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	
		es contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	2	2.	2		****/1400		4.26	4.27	4.28	
		techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	1	0	1	0	1		****/1179		3.95	3.96	4.02	
		Discussion														
Did c	lass discu	assions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	8	13	4.12	666/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	
		nts actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	422/1259		4.24	4.29	4.34	
		tor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	614/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	
		echniques successful	8	5	2	0	4	3	12	4.10	372/ 788			4.00	4.07	
		Laboratory														
Did t	he lab inc	rease understanding of the material	22	0	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	178/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	:
Were	you provid	led with adequate background informatio	n 22	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	99/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	
Were	necessary	materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	152/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	
Did t	he lab ins	structor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	137/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	
Were	requiremen	nts for lab reports clearly specified	22	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	
	Self Paced															
Did s	elf-paced	system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	,
	quency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n											
edits	s			Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
 00-27 28-55		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or			

Credits Earned		Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6	-					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	С	5	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	30	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201 University of Maryland
Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1226

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C) Spring 2006
Enrollment: 85
Questionnaires: 34 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	1	4	5	24	4.53	531/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	219/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	157/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	4	22	4.38	403/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	7	19	4.35	454/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	210/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	896/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	781/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.03
Lecture	1.0	•	0	0	_	_	1.0	4 60	610/1400	4 50	4 41	4 40	4 42	4 44
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	618/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	7	8		1084/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	502/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	Τ	T	2	11	4.31	,	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	8	13	4.12	666/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	422/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	614/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	2	0	4	3	12	4.10	372/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	178/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	99/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	152/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	137/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
_			.,											
Frequ	.ency	Dist	rıbı	utioi	1									

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cu		ned Cum. GPA			Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	С	5	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

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

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 76 Questionnaires: 44 Spring 2006

Page 1227 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
General	1	0	^	0	0	11	0.0	4 00	070/1401	4 20	4 0 4	4 00	4 00	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	8	11	22	4.23	870/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	30	4.63	374/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	236/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	364/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	2	2	6	./	14	3.94	772/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	290/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	8	31	4.60	344/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	13	27	4.63	238/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	Λ	2	40	4.93	131/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	350/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.43	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	34	4.74	278/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.07	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	2	0		36	4.74	324/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.27	4.20
<del>-</del>	1	3	0	0		2			- ,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	U	U	3	ь	31	4.70	162/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	3	2	1	13	4.10	674/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	895/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	4	0	6	11	4.14	837/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	282/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	1	1.0	4.60	64/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	4.60
<del>_</del>		0	0	1	0	4	12	4.67	53/ 249	4.54		4.11	4.23	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0			4.67	125/ 249	4.42	4.40 4.36		4.23	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29					5	9		- ,			4.40		
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	73/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														

#### Frequency Distribution

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 43 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 68 \*\*\*\* 4.84 4.49 4.70 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. Gl			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	35	
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	14							
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major	9	
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	38					
				?	1							

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1228

JUN 13, 2006

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 1 0 0 2 8 11 22 4.23 870/1481 4.32 4.24 4.29 4.29 4.23 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 10 30 4.63 374/1481 4.73 4.23 4.23 4.23 4.63 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 8 34 4.77 236/1249 4.85 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.77 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 14 0 0 2 8 18 4.57 364/1424 4.65 4.22 4.21 4.27 4.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 11 2 2 6 7 14 3.94 772/1396 3.92 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.94 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 18 0 0 3 6 16 4.52 290/1342 4.36 4.10 4.07 4.12 4.52 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 1 3 8 31 4.60 344/1459 4.67 4.21 4.16 4.17 4.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 0 41 5.00 1/1480 4.91 4.69 4.68 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0 1 10 15 8 3.88 989/1450 4.01 4.03 4.09 4.10 4.15 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 22 0 0 Ω 3 6 13 4.45 826/1409 4.59 4.41 4.42 4.43 4.61 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 21 0 0 0 4 10 9 4.22 1272/1407 4.36 4.68 4.69 4.67 4.49 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 22 0 0 1 7 6 8 3.95 1049/1399 4.43 4.28 4.26 4.27 4.28 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 22 0 1 2 3 5 11 4.05 1004/1400 4.44 4.26 4.27 4.28 4.31 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 21 3 1 0 4 8 7 4.00 590/1179 4.33 3.95 3.96 4.02 4.22 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2.4 0 2 1 13 4.10 674/1262 4.04 3.90 4.05 4.14 4.10 1 6 3 11 4.00 895/1259 4.20 4.24 4.29 4.34 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 23 0 0 4 0 6 11 4.14 837/1256 4.32 4.30 4.30 4.34 4.14 4. Were special techniques successful 23 10 0 1 1 3 6 4.27 282/ 788 3.90 3.89 4.00 4.07 4.27 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29 0 4 10 4.60 64/ 246 4.26 4.03 4.20 4.20 4.60 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 0 1 0 2 12 4.67 53/ 249 4.54 4.40 4.11 4.23 4.67 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 0 1 0 5 9 4.47 125/ 242 4.42 4.36 4.40 4.36 4.47 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 30 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 73/240 4.52 4.34 4.20 3.96 4.71 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 30 4 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 \*\*\*\*/ 217 \*\*\*\* 3.89 4.04 4.11 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 43 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 68 \*\*\*\* 4.84 4.49 4.70 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum.		A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	14						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	С	6	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301 University of Maryland Title

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. C) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 76

Questionnaires: 44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1229

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

					equei		s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
. Did you gain new in		om this course	1	0	0	2	8	11	22	4.23	870/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.23
2. Did the instructor	-		1	0	0	0	3	10	30	4.63	374/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.63
B. Did the exam questi	ons reflect the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	236/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.77
. Did other evaluation	ons reflect the ex	spected goals	2	14	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	364/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.57
. Did assigned readin	gs contribute to	what you learned	2	11	2	2	6	7	14	3.94	772/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.94
5. Did written assignm	ments contribute t	to what you learned	1	18	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	290/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.52
$^{\prime}.$ Was the grading sys		ained	1	0	0	1	3	8	31	4.60	344/1459		4.21	4.16	4.17	4.60
B. How many times was			2	1	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1480		4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00
). How would you grade	the overall tead	ching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	9	17	7	3.94	931/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.15
	Lecture															
. Were the instructor	's lectures well	prepared	22	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	826/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.61
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							9	10		1232/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.49
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						6	7	9	4.14	938/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	4.28
			22 21	0	1	2 1	2	5	12	4.14	961/1400		4.26	4.27	4.28	4.31
5. Did audiovisual tec	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi							8	7	3.95	641/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.22
	Discussion															
. Did class discussion			24	0	1	3	2	1	13	4.10	674/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.10
2. Were all students a			22	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	895/1259		4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor	-	nd open discussion	23	0	0	4	0	6	11	4.14	837/1256		4.30	4.30	4.34	4.14
. Were special techni	ques successful		23	10	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	282/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.27
	Laboratory															
. Did the lab increas			29	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 246		4.03	4.20	4.20	4.60
2. Were you provided w			29	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	53/ 249		4.40	4.11	4.23	4.67
B. Were necessary mate			29	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	125/ 242		4.36	4.40	4.36	4.47
. Did the lab instruc	-		30	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	73/ 240		4.34	4.20	3.96	4.71
6. Were requirements f	or lab reports cl	learly specified	30	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****
	Seminar									= 00						
. Were assigned topic	e announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
Frequency Distribution																
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	1			Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 1 0	 0.00-0.99 0	A 19		Re	 quir	ed fo	 or M	 ajor	 `S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	35
	00-1.99 1	В 14						- 5	-							
	2.00-2.99 8	С 6		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 4	14	Non-	-major	9
	3.00-3.49 10	D 0									3				3 - "	
Grad. 0 3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
I 0					her				3	88						
? 1																

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Title Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 24

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1230 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	O control on a	<b>1</b> TD	377		equer			-		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did	you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	8	7	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75
	the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	4	11		1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
	the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	839/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13
	other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	645/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33
	assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	3.75	918/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.75
6. Did	written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	474/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was	the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	4	12	4.04	940/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.04
8. How	many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	1133/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.38
9. How	would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left( t\right) =\left( t\right) +\left( t\right) $	2	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1005/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38
	Lecture														
	e the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	8	11		1055/1409	3.74		4.42	4.43	3.38
	the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	766/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94
	lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	7	9		1002/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.41
	the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	2	12		1017/1400		4.26	4.27	4.28	3.28
5. Did	audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	6	6	3	1	2.55	1125/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.45
1 543	Discussion	0	0	2	4	-	2	_	2 14	1101/1060	2 20	2 00	4 05	4 1 4	2 14
	class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	/	3	10		1121/1262		3.90	4.05	4.14	3.14
	e all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1 2	1	6	3	10			3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91
	the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	5	2	2	5	5 5	9		1000/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.86
4. were	e special techniques successful	2	5	4	2	5	5	3	3.29	682/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.29
	Laboratory														
1 Did	the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
	e you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
	e necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 242		4.36	4.40	4.36	****
	the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****
	e requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 217		3.89	4.04	4.11	****
										,					
	Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	1	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant		
				I	0	Other	24	-				
				?	0							

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

Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 24

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1231 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	8	7	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	4	11		1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	839/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	645/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	9		3.75	918/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	474/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	4	12	4.04	940/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	1133/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	1	6	4	1	3.07	1346/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	3	5	2	3	3.38	1315/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1350/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1246/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1230/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1128/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	3	5	3.14	1121/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	7	3	10	3.91	978/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	6	5	9	3.86	1000/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	682/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utior	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101 University of Maryland
Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County

I

?

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1232

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 24
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

(Instr. C)

Instructor:

Quescionn	.aircs. 2	. 1	Brudent Cot	TDE	Буаті	uuti	J11 Q	ucsti	OIIII	alle							
						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 vo	u gain ne	ew insights, skills fr	rom this course	0	0	1	2	6	8	7	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75
		ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	2	7	4	11		1000/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
		estions reflect the		0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13			4.32	4.27		4.13
	_	ations reflect the e	-	0	0	0	0	4	8		4.33				4.21	4.27	4.33
		adings contribute to		0	0	0	3	6	9	6		918/1396			3.98	4.00	3.75
		signments contribute		0	0	0	1	2	9	12		474/1342			4.07	4.12	4.33
		system clearly expl		0	0	1	1	6	4	12		940/1459		4.21	4.16		4.04
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	1	4	4	15		1133/1480		4.69	4.68	4.65	4.38
		grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	10	1	0	2	2	7	2		1146/1450		4.03	4.09		
		Lecture															
1 Were t	he instri	ctor's lectures well	prepared	13	0	0	3	5	2	1	3 09	1352/1409	3 74	4.41	4 42	4.43	3.38
		tor seem interested		13	0	0	0	4	5			1337/1407		4.68	4.69		
		erial presented and	_	13	0	0	2	3	5			1248/1399			4.26		3.41
		es contribute to what		13	0	1	2	4	3			1308/1400					
		techniques enhance	-	13	3	2	3	1	2			1142/1179					
		<b>D</b>															
1 Did cl	agg diger	Discussion Issions contribute to	what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	3	5	3 14	1121/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4 14	3.14
		its actively encourage	2	2	0	1	1	7	3			978/1259		4.24	4.29		3.91
		tor encourage fair a		2	0	2	0	6	5			1000/1256			4.30		
		chniques successful	and open discussion	2	5	2	2	5	5			682/ 788					
		Laboratory															
1 Did +b	e lah ind	rease understanding	of the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
		led with adequate bac		22	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 249		4.40	4.11		****
		materials available		22	0	1	0	1	0	-		****/ 242			4.40	4.36	****
		structor provide assi		22	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 240			4.20	3.96	****
		its for lab reports o		22	0	1	0	0	0	-		****/ 217					****
	-	-			- 54-4			_									
			Frequ	iency	, DT2	rr.TD1	uL101	11									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 18		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	`s	0	Graduat	 :е	0	Majo	· or	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	в 5			-			-						,		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 2	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0		Means t			_	յh
			P 0									respons	ses to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
			- Λ		←1	h 0 30				2	1						

Other

24

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101 University of Maryland
Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County

(Instr. D)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1233

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 24
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

~							~										
						Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	m this course	0	0	1	2	6	8	7	3 75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	2	7	4	11		1000/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
		lestions reflect the e		0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13				4.27		4.13
	_	ations reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33			4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33
		adings contribute to	- 3	0	0	0	3	6	9			918/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	3.75
		signments contribute t		0	0	0	1	2	-	-		474/1342		4.10	4.07		4.33
		g system clearly expla		0	0	1	1	6	-			940/1459		4.21	4.16	4.17	
		was class cancelled	IIIca	0	0	0	1	4	4			1133/1480		4.69	4.68		4.38
		grade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	12	2	1	1	6	2			1386/1450					
J. HOW	would you s	grade the Overail teac	ning effectiveness	1.2	2		_	U	2	U	2.50	1300/1430	3.49	1.03	4.00	4.10	3.30
		Lecture															
1. Were	e the instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	13	0	0	3	7	1	0	2.82	1383/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.38
2. Did	the instruc	ctor seem interested i	n the subject	13	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1376/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94
3. Was	lecture mat	erial presented and e	xplained clearly	13	0	0	5	4	2	0	2.73	1366/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.41
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	13	0	2	3	4	2	0	2.55	1360/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.28
5. Did	audiovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	13	3	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1142/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.45
		Discussion															
		ssions contribute to		2	0	3	4	7	3			1121/1262		3.90	4.05	4.14	
		nts actively encourage		2	0	1	1	7	3	10	3.91	,		4.24	4.29	4.34	
		ctor encourage fair an	d open discussion	2	0	2	0	6	5			1000/1256		4.30		4.34	
4. Were	e special te	echniques successful		2	5	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	682/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.29
		Laboratory															
1 Did	the lab inc	rease understanding o	f the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 246	2.65	4 03	4.20	4.20	****
		ded with adequate back		22	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 249			4.11	4.23	****
		materials available f		22	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 242			4.40	4.36	****
		structor provide assis		22	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 240		4.34	4.20	3.96	****
		its for lab reports cl		22	0	1	0	0	0	-		****/ 217			4.04		****
J. WEIG	e requiremen	ics for fab reports tr	earry specified	22	U		U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 21/	3.21	3.09	1.01	4.11	
			Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
a 11.	- 1	Cum. GPA					_					_					
Credits	s Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 18		Rec	mir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r .r	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		1000	1411	- Lu	JI 110	. ,		Ü	Gradaac	_	· ·	11000	/_	23
56-83	=	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	:4	Non-	-major	1
84-150		3.00-3.49 2	D 0		001	- C- C	_				· ·	011461 9		-	1,011	502	_
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enona	h	
oraa.	Ü	P 0								-	respons				_		
			I O		Otł	ıer				2	:4	2020115		91	car		
			? 0		0.01					_	-						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE

Enrollment:

46 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1234 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	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	0	0	2	1	9	11	6	3.62	1315/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	0	9	10	6		1296/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	12	9	3.93	953/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	14	9	4.07	928/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	5	10	6	3	2.90	1329/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	17	8	4.14	660/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	11	8	8	3.76	1154/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	880/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	14	6	1	3.13	1338/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	5	10	9	3.72	1258/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	6	12	6	3.62	1359/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	12	9	3	3.31	1282/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	13	4	5	3.17	1296/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	3	5	10	7	3.73	806/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	6	3	6	3.56	976/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	4	4	3	7		1052/1259		4.24	4.29	4.34	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	5	7	4		1069/1256		4.30	4.30	4.34	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	1	0	0	2	2		****/ 788		3.89	4.00	4.07	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 242		4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****		3.92	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****		4.75	4.67	****
Frequ	iency	, Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				2	Λ						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 47

46

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1235 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0		1.0	1.0	_	2 55	1241/1401	2 55	4 0 4	4 00	4 00	2 55
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	16	16	9		1341/1481		4.24	4.29	4.29	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	7	17	17		1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	16	19	4.02	885/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	16	20	4.04	,	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	19	4	10	5	5		1377/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	2.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	8	20	14		871/1342		4.10	4.07	4.12	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	2	15	21	4.07			4.21	4.16	4.17	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	2	16	26		1093/1480		4.69	4.68	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	16	16	4	3.41	1262/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	7	11	27	4.37	935/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	6	13	26	4.37	1205/1407		4.68	4.69	4.67	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	13	11	17		1135/1399		4.28	4.26	4.27	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	6	4	13	19		1120/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	4	9	8	19		739/1179		3.95	3.96	4.02	3.84
Discussion		_	_		_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	5	2	7	5	6		1092/1262		3.90	4.05	4.14	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	7	8	7		1083/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	2	8	5	8		1084/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	697/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.21
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	5	0	0	1	0	4		****/ 217			4.04	4.11	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 63	****	4.74			****
										****		4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45 45	0	0	0 1	1	0	1		****/ 69 ****/ 68	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	U	U	1	U	U	1	3.50	^^^^	^^^	4.04	3.92	4.43	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	***	4.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	٥	3 00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	4.11	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, -	****			4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0		, -	****	3.89	4.65 4.83	4.88	****
4. Was the reedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46 46	0	0	0	U T	0	1		****/ 24		3.82 4.08	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 24		4.08	4.82	4.0/	

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor:

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 47

Baltimore County MILLER, WENDY R Spring 2006

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1235

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	42
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	9	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	5
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	40				
				?	0						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: Alonso, Diane

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1236 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			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	0	0	1	2	1	9	10	4.09	1018/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	493/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	298/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	773/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	459/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	10	8	4.09	707/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	565/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	351/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	494/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	6	16	4.57	693/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	975/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	523/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	624/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	124/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	Ο	2	6	12	4.33	507/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	5	1	14	4.29	764/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	457/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	1	1	6	8	3.79	522/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	5	6	4	1	4	2.65	245/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	2.65
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	3	3	8	4	3.45	201/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	3.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	3	1	3	2	0	3.74	221/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	3.74
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	5	5	6	3.50	199/ 240	3.74	4.34	4.40	3.96	3.74
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	3	3	5	3	5	3.21	188/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.20	4.11	3.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	3		3	3	5	3	ی	3.41	T00/ ZI/	3.41	3.09	4.04	4.11	3.41

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0		10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	-			
				?	1						

Title LAUGHTER AND HUMOR (SS

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

= 11 ··· F6

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 34

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1237 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Co	urse Eval	luation (	)uesti	ionnai	ire
------------	-----------	-----------	--------	--------	-----

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		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	0	0	1	6	9	8	10	3.59	1330/1481	3.59	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	12	14	6	3.68	1248/1481	3.68	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	12	10	3.85	1001/1249	3.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	11	13	6	3.67	1224/1424	3.67	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	7	20	4.36	411/1396	4.36	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	8	9	7	5	3.03	1265/1342	3.03	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	13	12	4.06	929/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	32	4.94	491/1480	4.94	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	9	18	4	3.62	1184/1450	3.62	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	11	10	8	3.56	1287/1409	3.56	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	986/1407	4.65	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	5	13	9	3.68	1192/1399	3.68	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	7	5	15	3.79	1125/1400	3.79	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	3	7	11	13	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	6	7	4	4	2.92	1170/1262	2.92	3.90	4.05	4.14	2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	6	4	12	3.96	928/1259	3.96	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	5	6	11	3.96	934/1256	3.96	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	9	19	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	С	4	General	14	Under-grad	34	Non-major	20
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there a	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 335 0101 Universit Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO Baltin

Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN

Enrollment: 85
Questionnaires: 58

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1238 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluat	ion Questionnaire
------------------------	-------------------

			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	5	0	0	0	4	15	34	4.57	496/1481	4.06	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	18	35	4.66	324/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	4	12	36	4.62	393/1249	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	6	20	24	4.36	607/1424	3.85	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	0	1	7	13	27	4.38	403/1396	4.10	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	7	20	24	4.29	519/1342	4.24	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	13	38	4.66	276/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	41	11	4.21	1245/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	20	28	4.49	347/1450	4.06	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	1	49	4.83	290/1409	4.87	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	6	47	4.89	545/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	9	43	4.79	223/1399	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	11	39	4.71	361/1400	4.21	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	12	37	4.69	167/1179	4.14	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	897/1262	3.52	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	****/1259	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	****/1256	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	42	11	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 788	4.00	3.89	4.00	4.07	****
-														

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	### - Means ### - Means ### - Means the responses to be	Grades Reasons Type				Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	39
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	58	Non-major	19
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	42	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 335 8020 Title

University of Maryland PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: REICHERT Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

23

Page 1239 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	Λ	2	2	1	2 55	1344/1481	4.06	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	2	3		1368/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	1	3		1159/1249	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	2	2		1316/1424	3.85	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.82	869/1396	4.10	4.22	3.98	4.27	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.10	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	U T	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.20	659/1459	4.24	4.10	4.16	4.17	4.36
	0	0	0	0	U T	∠ 3	, 8	4.36	904/1480	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	4	3	1		1179/1450		4.03	4.08		3.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Τ	2	U	U	4	3	Τ	3.63	11/9/1450	4.06	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	188/1409	4.87	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1140/1399	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	1170/1400	4.21	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	860/1179		3.95	3.96	4.02	3.60
o. Dia addio.ibddi ocomiiqaeb emanec year anderboanding	Ü	_	Ū	_	J	_		3.00	000, 11,		3.75	3.70	1.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1070/1262	3.52	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	742/1256	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.00

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

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101 University of Maryland SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY SHAWN

Baltimore County Spring 2006

TILLE	SUCTAL P
Instructor:	BEDIAKO,

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 36

Page 1240 JUN 13, 2006 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	1	0	0	0	4	10	21	4.49	574/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	18	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	14	14	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	6	12	11	3.91	1087/1424	3.91	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	7	24	4.53	285/1396	4.53	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	8	8	12	3.69	1028/1342	3.69	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	8	23	4.43	580/1459	4.43	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	16	4.46	1079/1480	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	13	13	4.39	483/1450	4.39	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	12	22	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7.2	32	4.91	450/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.43	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	14	17	4.37	713/1399	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	25	4.51	581/1400	4.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	5	1	10	1	25		1099/1179	2.80	3.95	3.96	4.20	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	5	Т	10	1	3	2.80	1099/11/9	2.80	3.95	3.90	4.02	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	5	4	20	4.52	340/1262	4.52	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	358/1259	4.76	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	224/1256	4.90	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	5	8	15	4.36	244/ 788	4.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.36
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	12
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_			
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101 University of Maryl Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION Baltimore County Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID Spring 2006

University of Maryland Page 1241
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	61			
Questionnaires:	34	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

							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 vo	u dain ne	Genera ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	2	17	14	4.29	792/1481	4.53	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	6	10	17	4.26	811/1481		4.23	4.23	4.23	4.26
		uestions reflec			0	0	2	1	3	14	14	4.09	861/1249	4.12	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.09
		uations reflect			0	1	1	3	8	13	8		1202/1424		4.22	4.21	4.27	3.73
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	11	20		274/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	4.55
				to what you learned	1	0	1	3		12	8		1023/1342		4.10	4.07		3.70
		g system clearl			1	0	0	1	3	11	18	4.39			4.21	4.16	4.17	4.39
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94			4.69	4.68	4.65	4.94
				ching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	5	11	11	4.07	803/1450	4.38	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.07
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	1	3	9	18	4.31	990/1409	4.39	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.31
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	941/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.69
				explained clearly	2	0	0	2	6	12	12	4.06	980/1399	4.34	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.06
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	1	1	2	14	13	4.19	913/1400	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.19
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	1	6	7	17	4.29	411/1179	4.01	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	570/1262	4.28	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.25
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	14	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	588/1259	4.63	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	571/1256	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.50
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		14	4	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	707/ 788	3.13	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.13
		Labora	tory															
2. Were ye	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10				ed f					Graduat		 0	Majo		24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 13		re(	4utt (	=u I	OT I	a jui	۵	U	Graduati	C	U	Ma JC	) <u>T</u>	44
26-33 56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C 6		Cer	nera	1			1	.3	Under-g	rad 3	2.4	Non-	-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0		GEI	лста.	_			_		onder -g.	rau 3	, 1	INOII-	ilia JUI	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		בום	ecti	760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enouc	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		11.7	CCLI	vca				J	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	ner				1	.4	T Cabolla	בט נט ג	c argii	ııııcaı	10	
				? 2		001												
				; <u></u>														

Course-Section: PSYC 342 8020 University of Maryland Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal

Enrollment: 28 Ouestionnaires: 28

Spring	2006

Page 1242

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* 4.11 4.55 4.88 \*\*\*\*

0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 31 \*\*\*\* 4.14 4.75 4.67 \*\*\*\*

27 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 3.89 4.65 4.88 \*\*\*\*

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 15 0 0 0 1 1 11 4.77 280/1481 4.53 4.24 4.29 4.29 4.77 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 15 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 481/1481 4.40 4.23 4.23 4.23 4.54 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 15 0 0 0 5 1 7 4.15 817/1249 4.12 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.15 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 15 2 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 497/1424 4.09 4.22 4.21 4.27 4.45 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 169/1396 4.62 4.00 3.98 4.00 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 2 4 7 4.38 424/1342 4.04 4.10 4.07 4.12 4.38 3 1 3 4 1 2.92 1403/1459 3.66 4.21 4.16 4.17 2.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 15 1 8. How many times was class cancelled 15 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 871/1480 4.85 4.69 4.68 4.65 4.77 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0 0 0 0 4 9 4.69 196/1450 4.38 4.03 4.09 4.10 4.69 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 15 0 0 1 1 2 9 4.46 813/1409 4.39 4.41 4.42 4.43 4.46 15 0 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 12 4.92 400/1407 4.81 4.68 4.69 4.67 4.92 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 445/1399 4.34 4.28 4.26 4.27 4.62 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 312/1400 4.47 4.26 4.27 4.28 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16 1 1 0 3 4 3 3.73 813/1179 4.01 3.95 3.96 4.02 3.73 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 537/1262 4.28 3.90 4.05 4.14 4.31 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 358/1259 4.63 4.24 4.29 4.34 4.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 264/1256 4.67 4.30 4.30 4.34 4.85 4. Were special techniques successful 15 7 0 1 1 1 3 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 788 3.13 3.89 4.00 4.07 \*\*\*\* Self Paced

#### Frequency Distribution

27 0

27 0 0

0

0 1

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

Course-Section: PSYC 355 0101 Unitle COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: WISNIEWSKI, TIM
Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1243 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	=	this course	3	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.67
_	_	tor make clear			4	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	458/1481	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.55
		estions reflect			4	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	298/1249	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.70
	_	ations reflect			4	5	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	928/1424	4.07	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.07
				hat you learned	3	0	0	0	6	7	8	4.10	649/1396	4.10	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.10
				what you learned		13	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	755/1342		4.10	4.07	4.12	4.00
		system clearly		-	3	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	436/1459	4.52	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.52
		was class cance	_		3	0	0	0	1	18	2		1339/1480	4.05	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.05
				ning effectiveness		0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.03	4.09		4.60
				3														
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	5	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	603/1409	4.63	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.63
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested ir	n the subject	5	0	0	0	3	0	16	4.68	941/1407	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.68
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	3	2	14	4.58	491/1399	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.58
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	1	16	4.74	336/1400	4.74	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.74
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	5	2	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	746/1179	3.82	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.82
		Discuss																
				hat you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	236/1262		3.90	4.05		4.71
				l to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	257/1259	4.86	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.86
		_		l open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.86
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	sstul		10	5	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	98/ 788	4.78	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.78
				<b>7</b>		- D.	1											
				Freq	uency	7 Dis	tribi	ut10	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	11
28-55												_	_					
56-83						General 5 Under-grad 24 N				Non-	major	13						
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Electives 0 #### - Means there are not e						_	ıh					
	Р 0					responses to be significant					ıt							
	I 0				Other 13													
	? 0																	

Course-Section: PSYC 356 0101 University of Maryland Title PSYC OF SEX DIFFERENCE

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 44 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1244 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

						Frequencies		s	Instructor		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 1101	. anin na	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this source	0	0	1	1	_	1	7	2 02	1206/1481	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.83
		ctor make clear			0	0	Τ.	7	<i>1</i>	8	1		1194/1481	3.78	4.24	4.23	4.23	3.78
		lestions reflec		_	0	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.76		3.78	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.76
	_	ations reflect			0	1	0	2	4	2	9	4.06		4.06	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.06
				what you learned	0	0	5	1	4	5	2		1292/1396	3.00	4.22	3.98	4.27	3.00
				o what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	3	5 6	4.36	. ,		4.10	4.07	4.12	4.36
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11	, -	4.11	4.10	4.16	4.17	4.11
		was class canc		illea	0	0	0	0	6	11	1		1442/1480	3.72	4.69	4.16	4.17	3.72
				hing effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	4	3		1223/1450	3.72	4.03	4.09		3.72
9. HOW WOL	ara you g	grade the overa	II Leac	ming effectiveness	4	U	Τ	Τ	5	4	3	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.50
		Lecture	Δ.															
1 Were th	ne instri		_	prepared	2	0	1	0	3	2	10	4 25	1031/1409	4.25	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.25
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							1	2	5	Ω		1257/1407	4.25	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.25
				explained clearly	2 2	0	0	2	2	4	0	4.13	- ,	4.13	4.28	4.26	4.07	4.13
		es contribute to			2	0	2	1	3	1	9		1098/1400	3.88	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.88
				you rearned our understanding	3	0	0	2	3	0	10	4.20			3.95	3.96		4.20
5. Did auc	ilovisual	r techniques em	nance y	four understanding	3	U	U	2	3	U	10	4.20	40//11/9	4.20	3.95	3.90	4.02	4.20
		Discus	aion															
1 Did ala	ana dina			what you learned	11	0	Λ	0	Λ	1	6	4.86	146/1262	4.86	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.86
				ed to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	- ,	4.86	4.24	4.03	4.34	4.86
		-	_	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	- ,	4.86	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.86
		echniques succe		d open discussion	11	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	515/ 788	3.80	3.89	4.00		3.80
4. Were St	peciai te	ecimiques succes	SSLUI		TT	2	U	Τ	1	Т	2	3.00	515/ /00	3.00	3.09	4.00	4.07	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 10	_													
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	nera:	l			1	0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	9
84-150 9 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0																		
Grad.	F 0	Electives						0 #### - Means there an				re not	enoug	h				

Other

8

Ρ

I

0

0

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI

RABIN, BERNARD Instructor:

Enrollment: 105 Questionnaires: 52

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1245 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque	ncie 3	:s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	9	16	11	11		1413/1481		4.24	4.29	4.29	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	9	8	18	5	10		1424/1481	3.10	4.23	4.23	4.23	2.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	10	12	11	7	11		1202/1249	2.97	4.32	4.27	4.28	2.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	41	1	2	4	1	1		****/1424		4.22	4.21	4.27	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	11	14	9	10	4		1356/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	45	1	2	2	0	0		****/1342		4.10	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	7	5	13	24	3.98		3.90	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	18	18	4	8		1469/1480	3.82	4.69	4.68	4.65	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	7	3	13	16	2	3.07	1346/1450	2.97	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	11	36		588/1409		4.41	4.42	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	4	11	34	4.54	1076/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	8	9	17	11		1255/1399	3.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	6	7	14	18		1197/1400		4.26	4.27	4.28	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	5	9	9	17	3.74	800/1179	3.37	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	14	3	6	2	2	2.07	1243/1262	2.30	3.90	4.05	4.14	2.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	10	2	7	2	4	2.52	1225/1259	2.33	4.24	4.29	4.34	2.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	8	3	6	2	5	2.71	1210/1256	2.62	4.30	4.30	4.34	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	27	24	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 249	***	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	***	4.04	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****
Frequ	encv	Dis	trib	utio	n									
	2													

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	9	C	16	General	5	Under-grad	52	Non-major	24
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI

RABIN, BERNARD

Instructor:

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 24

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1246 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies Instru		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	5	2	7	4	5	3.09	1443/1481	3.20	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	5	5	3.22	1392/1481	3.10	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	10	1	4	5	3.00	1193/1249	2.97	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	4	3	1	2	4	2.93	1380/1424	2.93	4.22	4.21	4.27	2.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	3	6	5	3	2.83	1338/1396	2.73	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	1	12	3.83	1109/1459	3.90	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	974/1480	3.82	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.64
	10	0	3	1	6	3			1392/1450	2.97	4.03		4.10	2.86
									, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	2	4	14	4.17	1080/1409	4.41	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	4	3	13		1279/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	7	2	3	5	4		1352/1399	3.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	2.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	2	3	6	_		1312/1400	3.31		4.27	4.28	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	7	2	4	2	_		1041/1179					3.00
J. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	2	U	,	2	-		,	3.00	1041/11/2	3.37	3.93	3.90	1.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	2	2	6	2	2 52	1221/1262	2.30	3.90	4.05	4.14	2.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	9	5	3	3	1		1246/1259	2.33	4.24	4.03	4.34	2.14
	3	0	5	6	5 5	4	_		1219/1256	2.53		4.29	4.34	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	16	2	1	5 1	0	1		****/ 788	∠.0∠ ****	3.89	4.30	4.34	∠.5∠ ****
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	2	Т	Τ	U	Т	2.40	***/ /88		3.89	4.00	4.07	* * * *
T a bassa bassa														
Laboratory	0.0	-1	^	1	0	^	^	0 00	****/ 046	444	4 02	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1 0	0	1 0	0	0	0		****/ 246	++++	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	U	U	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	^ ^ ^ ^
Seminar	0.0	0	-	0	0	_	•	1 00		also also also also	4 0 4	4 40	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 69	****		4.53	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work		_		_	_	_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI

Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1246 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	4			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 363 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title EATING: NORMAL/ABNORMA Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE Spring 2006

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1247

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	14	4.14	976/1481	4.14	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	19	4.38	693/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	488/1249	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	8	15	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	8	3	11	3.45	1114/1396	3.45	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	8	14	4.17	615/1342	4.17	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.17
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	321/1459	4.62	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	3		1324/1480	4.11	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	9	11	5	3.63	1179/1450	3.63	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	8	16	4.32	979/1409	4.32	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	1031/1407	4.61	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	7	6	14	4.14	929/1399	4.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	7	16	4.21	898/1400	4.21	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	3	3	4	15	4.12	549/1179	4.12	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1059/1262	3.33	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	2	2	0	7	3.83	1012/1259	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101 University of Maryland Title PERSONALITY Baltimore County Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 37

52

Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1248 JUN 13, 2006

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 0 0 1 0 12 10 14 3.97 1096/1481 4.31 4.24 4.29 4.29 3.97 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 29 0 2 4 11 20 4.32 747/1481 4.33 4.23 4.23 4.23 4.32 2 3 13 19 4.32 687/1249 4.39 4.32 4.27 4.28 4.32 0 1 2 4 4.43 \*\*\*\*/1424 3.93 4.22 4.21 4.27 \*\*\*\* 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 2 6 10 15 3.89 816/1396 4.09 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.89 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 32 01 1 2 4.25 \*\*\*\*/1342 3.76 4.10 4.07 4.12 \*\*\*\* 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 9 26 4.65 298/1459 4.25 4.21 4.16 4.17 4.65 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 4 32 4.89 729/1480 4.83 4.69 4.68 4.65 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1 0 6 13 7 3.93 945/1450 4.27 4.03 4.09 4.10 3.93 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω 3 7 26 4.54 716/1409 4.66 4.41 4.42 4.43 4.54 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 2 7 28 4.70 919/1407 4.83 4.68 4.69 4.67 4.70 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 1 15 19 4.35 733/1399 4.52 4.28 4.26 4.27 4.35 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 4 8 23 4.44 658/1400 4.63 4.26 4.27 4.28 4.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13 3 2 7 5 6 3.39 948/1179 3.64 3.95 3.96 4.02 3.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 23 0 5 3.36 1052/1262 3.81 3.90 4.05 4.14 3.36 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 23 0 5 3.50 1094/1259 4.16 4.24 4.29 4.34 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  $\begin{array}{cc} 23 & 0 \\ \end{array}$ 4 0 2 4 4 3.29 1141/1256 4.01 4.30 4.30 4.34 3.29 4. Were special techniques successful 23 11 0 1 1 1 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 788 \*\*\*\* 3.89 4.00 4.07 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 36 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 246 \*\*\*\* 4.03 4.20 4.20 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 249 \*\*\*\* 4.40 4.11 4.23 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 36 0 Ω Ω 1 Ω 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 242 \*\*\*\* 4.36 4.40 4.36 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 36 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 240 \*\*\*\* 4.34 4.20 3.96 \*\*\*\* 36 0 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 36 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 217 \*\*\*\* 3.89 4.04 4.11 \*\*\*\* 0 1 0 0 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 68 \*\*\*\* 4.84 4.49 4.70 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 36 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 69 \*\*\*\* 4.74 4.53 4.66 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 36 0 Ω 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 63 \*\*\*\* 4.66 4.44 4.56 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 36 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 69 \*\*\*\* 4.52 4.35 4.48 \*\*\*\* 1 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 68 \*\*\*\* 4.04 3.92 4.43 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 36 0 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 59 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.30 4.48 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 36 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 3.00 4.00 4.13 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 36 0 0 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.60 4.33 \*\*\*\* 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 36 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 36 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 3.50 4.26 3.90 \*\*\*\* 0 0 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 31 \*\*\*\* 4.00 4.42 4.00 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 36 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* 4.11 4.55 4.88 \*\*\*\* 36 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 31 \*\*\*\* 4.14 4.75 4.67 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 36 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 3.89 4.65 4.88 \*\*\*\* 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 36 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 34 \*\*\*\* 3.82 4.83 4.67 \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 36 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 \*\*\*\* 4.08 4.82 4.67 \*\*\*\* Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101
Title PERSONALITY
Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE
Enrollment: 52

Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1248 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	rned Cum. GPA			ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	С	3	General	3	Under-grad	37	Non-major	11
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	27	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 1249

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 57 Questionnaires: 39 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102

PERSONALITY

ANDERSON, ROBER

Title

Instructor:

	<del>-</del>				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Gamana l														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	27	4.64	417/1481	1 21	1 21	1 20	4.29	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	13	20	4.34	725/1481	4.31	4.24	4.23	4.23	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	23	4.46	548/1249	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	8	9	11		1048/1424		4.22	4.21	4.27	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	12	19	4.30	467/1396	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	8	15	10	3.76	987/1342		4.10	4.07	4.12	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	9	6	17		1094/1459	4.25	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	32	4.77	871/1480	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	4.62	252/1450		4.03	4.09		4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	367/1409	4.66	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	37	4.76	300/1409	4.83	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	8	29	4.68	349/1399	4.52	4.28	4.26	4.07	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	239/1400		4.26	4.27	4.28	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	2	8	8	9	3.89	705/1179	3.64		3.96	4.02	3.89
5. Dia addiovibuar econniques enhance your understanding	-	Ü	J	_	Ü	O		3.05	,03,11,7	3.01	3.75	3.70	1.02	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	563/1262	3.81	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	294/1259	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	382/1256	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	24	9	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory		_			_		_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37 37	1 1	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 240 ****/ 217	****	4.34	4.20	3.96 4.11	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	3 /	T	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 21/		3.09	4.04	4.11	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	3.90	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****
0.15														
Self Paced	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 50	****/	****	1 11	4 EF	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37 37	0 1	0	0	1 1	1	0		****/ 55 ****/ 31	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31 ****/ 51	****	4.14	4.75	4.67 4.88	****
<ol> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> </ol>	37 37	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 34	****	3.89	4.65 4.83	4.88	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****
5. Here there charge proceeds for all the students	5 1	_	J	_	J	U	U	2.00	/ 24		1.00	1.02	1.07	

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102
Title PERSONALITY
Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

57

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1249 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	39	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	4						

Course-Section: PSYC 380H 0102 University of Maryland Page 1250
Title PERSONALITY HONORS Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10	
Questionnaires:	8	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	tructor Course Dept			UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did von	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	Ο	0	3	5	4.63	439/1481	4.63	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.63
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.75
	_	ations reflect		-	0	2	0	2	0	1	3		1138/1424		4.22	4.21	4.27	3.83
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	. ,		4.10	4.07	4.12	4.00
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	0	2	5		, -	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.38
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	245/1450	4.63	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.63
	Lecture																	
1 7/7 +10					0	0	0	0	0	2	_	1 (2	C10/1400	1 (2	1 11	4 40	1 12	1 (2
		ctor's lecture	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 8	4.63 5.00	618/1409 1/1407	4.63 5.00	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.63 5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	1	2		4.50		4.50	4.08	4.09	4.07	4.50
							0	1	0	2		4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.26	4.27	4.27	4.38
	<ol> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</li> </ol>					0 1	1	0	2	2		3.57	870/1179			3.96		3.57
5. Did aud	liovisuai	. teciniiques en	lance yo	our understanding	0	Τ.	1	U	2	4	2	3.57	0/0/11/9	3.57	3.95	3.90	4.02	3.57
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	645/1262	4.14	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.14
2. Were al	.l studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.57
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	754/1256	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.29
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		1	4	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	3.89	4.00	4.07	2.67
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	ırned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 4						quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55																		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ge	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101 Title

CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL

Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT

Enrollment: 57 Questionnaires: 35 Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1251 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					Inst	cructor			t UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	23	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	21	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	8	20	4.23	527/1396	4.23	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	8	20	4.34	464/1342	4.34	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	149/1459	4.83	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	24	10	4.29	1185/1480	4.29	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	14	4.41	459/1450	4.41	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	450/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	245/1399	4.77	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	27	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	5	12	16	4.26	434/1179	4.26	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	691/1262	4.05	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	532/1259	4.58	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	438/1256	4.68	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	16	13	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	13	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	35	Non-major	13
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0101
Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN

Enrollment: 56
Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1252 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie	S 1	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	al															
		w insights,ski			11	0	0	0	2	8	35	4.73	316/1481	4.72	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.73
		tor make clear			12	0	0	0	0	11	33	4.75	228/1481	4.66	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.75
	_	estions reflec		_	11	0	0	0	0	8	37	4.82	190/1249		4.32	4.27	4.28	4.82
		ations reflect	_		11	0	0	0	4	11	30	4.58	364/1424	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.58
				what you learned	12	0	5	5	8	9	17		1005/1396	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.64
		_		what you learned	11	0	0	1	6	14	24	4.36	454/1342	4.25	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.36
		ß system clearl		ined	11	0	0	0	1	6	38		149/1459		4.21	4.16	4.17	4.82
	_	was class cand			11	0	0	0	0	27	18		1114/1480		4.69	4.68	4.65	4.40
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	all teach	ning effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	15	29	4.66	224/1450	4.76	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.66
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture	_	_	11	0	0	0	0	3	42	4.93	131/1409	4.80	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.93
		tor seem inter		3	10	0	0	0	1	3	42	4.89	522/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.89
				plained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	162/1399	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.87
		s contribute t	_		12 11	0	0	0	0	3	41	4.93	102/1400	4.88	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.93
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin					0	1	0	3	4	37	4.69	167/1179	4.47	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.69
		Discus																
				what you learned	48	0	0	0	3	2	3		****/1262		3.90	4.05	4.14	****
				l to participate	48	0	0	0	0	1	7		****/1259		4.24	4.29	4.34	****
		_		d open discussion	48	0	0	0	0	0	8		****/1256		4.30	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	essful		48	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 788	4.33	3.89	4.00	4.07	****
		Labora	-															
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequa	ate backs	ground information	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 30						 guire		 or M	 a ior		6	Graduat		0	Majo		31
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12		1000	1411		- L 1'11	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	~	~	Gradat	_	-	1100	-	31
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	9	C 0		Ger	neral					9	Under-g	rad 5	6	Non-	major	25
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	18	D 0		001		-				-	011001 9		-	2.021		
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					Ele	ectiv	zes.				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
0144.	P 0											_	respons				_	
	I 0					Oth	ner				2	6	10050110					
	? 1																	

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1253 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: PSYC 385 8020

9

HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

ANDERSON, ROBER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

	Frequencies					Inst			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	5	4.71	340/1481	4.72	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.57	434/1481	4.66	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	ے 1	3	4.43	598/1249	4.63	4.32	4.23	4.28	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	807/1424	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	476/1396	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.14	649/1342		4.10	4.07	4.12	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	0		1380/1459	3.91	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	٥	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480		4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450		4.03	4.09	4.10	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	O	O	U	U	_	O	1.00	110/1100	1.70	1.05	1.00	1.10	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	4.80	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1399	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.88	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	442/1179	4.47	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.25
Plantania.														
Discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	_	4 02	154/1060	4 02	3.90	4 05	1 1 1	4 02
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5 4	4.83	154/1262 451/1259	4.83 4.67	4.24	4.05 4.29	4.14 4.34	4.83 4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.67	571/1256	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788		3.89	4.30	4.34	4.33
4. were special techniques successful	۷	2	U	U	Т	U	2	4.33	254/ /88	4.33	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.33
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re:	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
Expected Grades						, - – –				pc 				

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

Course-Section: PSYC 387 0101 University of Maryland Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY Instructor: MATON, KENNETH

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1254

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 17

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	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	758/1481	4.31	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	823/1396	3.88	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	494/1342	4.31	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	852/1409	4.44	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	613/1399	4.47	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	531/1400	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	6	0	5	2	1	2.43	1137/1179	2.43	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	Λ	2	5	8	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1259	4.73	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	382/1256	4.73	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.67
	_	ŭ	3	,	,		_ •	,		_,,,,	2.05			

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5	
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	9	•				
				2	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 393B 0101 University of Maryland Page 1255
Title PARENTING Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER, Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 31

FIII OTTHETIC:	31			
Questionnaires:	23	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

						Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5						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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	316/1481	4.74	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.74
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	246/1481	4.74	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.74
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	442/1249	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.57
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	334/1424	4.61	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.61
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	4	1	3	6	8	3.59	1030/1396	3.59	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.59
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	504/1342	4.30	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.30
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	1	1	20	4.70	242/1459	4.70	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.70
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1001/1480	4.59	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.59
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	525/1450	4.35	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.35
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		orepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	94/1409	4.95	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.95
					2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  Was lecture material presented and explained clear  Did the lastware contribute to what you leaved						0	0	0	3	18	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.86
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	73/1400	4.95	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.95
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	129/1179	4.76	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.76
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	305/1262	4.58	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.58
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	524/1259	4.58	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.58
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	•	11	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.67
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
a 11. 5		a ana		1 . 1	_			_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В б														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General							9	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1					_	βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0	Other						8							

Course-Section: PSYC 407 0101 University of Maryla Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: SONNENSCHEIN, S Spring 2006

University of Maryland Page 1256
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	19			
Questionnaires:	15	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Ouestion	c		Frequencie NR NA 1 2 3					3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean			
					NR NA 1 2													
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.20
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1179/1481	3.80	4.23	4.23	4.32	3.80
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1022/1249	3.80	4.32	4.27	4.44	3.80
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1116/1424	3.87	4.22	4.21	4.35	3.87
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	877/1396	3.80	4.00	3.98	4.09	3.80
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	999/1342	3.73	4.10	4.07	4.21	3.73
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	929/1459	4.07	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.07
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1245/1450	3.45	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.45
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1104/1409	4.13	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.13
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1084/1407	4.53	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.53	
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear									6	4	3.93	1067/1399	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.36	3.93
4. Did th	<ol> <li>was recture material presented and explained clear!</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>					0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	913/1400	4.20	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.20
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	2	0	7	4	2	3.27	994/1179	3.27	3.95	3.96	4.07	3.27
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.00
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	3	0		1	1	2	7	4.08	872/1259	4.08	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.08
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3		2		3	4	3	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	4.30	4.30	4.60	3.50
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	710/ 788	3.10	3.89	4.00	4.26	3.10
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		кес	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajor:	S	U	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8 C 2	G 1							2	TTm d and a		_	Mar		4
56-83 84-150		2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	1	C 2 D 0	General						2	Under-g	rad 1	. 5	Non-	major	4	
84-150 Grad.	0		4 4	D 0 F 0	77. a a b d a a a						1	инии -	Moona +	homo -	nc+	0000	-h	
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	4	P O	Electives						т	#### - Means there a				_	ltt	
				Р 0 Т 0	0+10				1	1	responses to be signific			ıııcan	l L			
				Ι υ	Other						1	. 1						

Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101

Title INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPME

Instructor: BAKER, LINDA

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1257 JUN 13, 2006 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	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	870/1481	4.24	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	979/1481	4.06	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	671/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.35	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	252/1396	4.59	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	615/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.21	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1109/1459	3.82	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	588/1409	4.65	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	733/1399	4.35	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	6	8	4.12	977/1400	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	384/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	315/1262	4.56	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	111/ 788	4.73	3.89	4.00	4.26	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	41/ 68	4.69	4.84	4.49	4.68	4.69
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	39/ 69	4.47	4.74	4.53	4.64	4.47
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	28/ 63	4.65	4.66	4.44	4.49	4.65
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	39/ 69	4.44	4.52	4.35	4.53	4.44
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	44/ 68	3.69	4.04	3.92	4.10	3.69

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-		_	
				?	1						

Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE

Instructor: FOX, MARY H

Enrollment: 45

Questionnaires: 42

Page 1258 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Transmit Course Dept   UMBC Level   Questions   NR NA   1   2   3   4   5   Mean   Rank   Mean   M	Sect Mean  3.63 3.77 3.93 3.97
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 7 0 2 7 4 11 11 3.63 1315/1481 3.63 4.24 4.29 4.45 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 1 5 7 10 12 3.77 1194/1481 3.77 4.23 4.23 4.32 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 8 6 1 1 6 11 9 3.93 962/1249 3.93 4.32 4.27 4.44 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8 0 0 4 5 13 12 3.97 997/1424 3.97 4.22 4.21 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 6 7 5 16 3.83 861/1396 3.83 4.00 3.98 4.09 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 3 7 10 14 3.86 912/1342 3.86 4.10 4.07 4.21	3.77 3.93
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 7 0 2 7 4 11 11 3.63 1315/1481 3.63 4.24 4.29 4.45 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 1 5 7 10 12 3.77 1194/1481 3.77 4.23 4.23 4.32 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 8 6 1 1 6 11 9 3.93 962/1249 3.93 4.32 4.27 4.44 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8 0 0 4 5 13 12 3.97 997/1424 3.97 4.22 4.21 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 6 7 5 16 3.83 861/1396 3.83 4.00 3.98 4.09 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 3 7 10 14 3.86 912/1342 3.86 4.10 4.07 4.21	3.77 3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 7 0 1 5 7 10 12 3.77 1194/1481 3.77 4.23 4.23 4.32 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 8 6 1 1 6 11 9 3.93 962/1249 3.93 4.32 4.27 4.44 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8 0 0 4 5 13 12 3.97 997/1424 3.97 4.22 4.21 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 6 7 5 16 3.83 861/1396 3.83 4.00 3.98 4.09 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 3 7 10 14 3.86 912/1342 3.86 4.10 4.07 4.21	3.77 3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 8 6 1 1 6 11 9 3.93 962/1249 3.93 4.32 4.27 4.44 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8 0 0 4 5 13 12 3.97 997/1424 3.97 4.22 4.21 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 6 7 5 16 3.83 861/1396 3.83 4.00 3.98 4.09 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 3 7 10 14 3.86 912/1342 3.86 4.10 4.07 4.21	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8 0 0 4 5 13 12 3.97 997/1424 3.97 4.22 4.21 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 6 7 5 16 3.83 861/1396 3.83 4.00 3.98 4.09 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 3 7 10 14 3.86 912/1342 3.86 4.10 4.07 4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned $6$ $1$ $1$ $6$ $7$ $5$ $16$ $3.83$ $861/1396$ $3.83$ $4.00$ $3.98$ $4.09$ $6.$ Did written assignments contribute to what you learned $6$ $0$ $2$ $3$ $7$ $10$ $14$ $3.86$ $912/1342$ $3.86$ $4.10$ $4.07$ $4.21$	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 0 2 3 7 10 14 3.86 912/1342 3.86 4.10 4.07 4.21	3.83
	3.86
	3.29
	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1 2 2 14 5 7 3.43 1253/1450 3.43 4.03 4.09 4.28	3.43
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 1 6 10 10 8 3.51 1291/1409 3.51 4.41 4.42 4.51	3.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 1 2 5 27 4.66 975/1407 4.66 4.68 4.69 4.79	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 3 5 7 10 10 3.54 1229/1399 3.54 4.28 4.26 4.36	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 2 8 3 8 14 3.69 1176/1400 3.69 4.26 4.27 4.38	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 6 2 1 6 10 9 3.82 746/1179 3.82 3.95 3.96 4.07	3.82
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0 2 1 3 4 8 3.83 842/1262 3.83 3.90 4.05 4.33	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0 1 0 1 2 14 4.56 548/1259 4.56 4.24 4.29 4.57	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion $24$ 0 1 0 1 4 12 $4.44$ $636/1256$ $4.44$ $4.30$ $4.30$ $4.60$	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful 24 2 0 0 5 4 7 4.13 358/788 4.13 3.89 4.00 4.26	4.13
Laboratory	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material $$ 41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.03 4.20 4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ $249$ **** $4.40$ $4.11$ $3.87$	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities $$ 41 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 1 5.00 ****/ 242 **** 4.36 4.40 4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 240 **** 4.34 4.20 4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 217 **** 3.89 4.04 3.86	****
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 68 **** 4.84 4.49 4.68$ 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention $41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 69 **** 4.74 4.53 4.64$	****
I was one instituted to institute the institute and the institute the in	****
	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 41 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.52 4.35 4.53 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.04 3.92 4.10	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear 41 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 4447 00 4.04 5.92 4.10	
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned $$ 41 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 5.00 4.30 4.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria $41$ 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 3.00 4.00 4.56	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.60 4.91	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 41 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** 3.50 4.26 4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 41 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.00 4.42 4.83	****
Self Paced	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.11 4.55 4.86	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 40 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.14 4.75 5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 40 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 3.89 4.65 4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 40 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 34 **** 3.82 4.83 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 40 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.08 4.82 5.00	****

Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE

Instructor: FOX, MARY H

Enrollment: 45

Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1258 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	28		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5								
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	42	Non-major	14		
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	7	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h		
				P	0			responses to be significant					
				I	0	Other	19						
				?	0								

Course-Section: PSYC 446 0101

Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FOX, MARY H

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 1259 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect			
Ouestions	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	7	0	0	1	3	11	17	4.38	708/1481	4.44	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	3	3	8	18	4.28	790/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	393/1249	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	3	1	1	3	5	18	4.36	620/1424		4.22	4.21	4.35	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1		11		4.44	355/1396		4.00	3.98	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4			4.41			4.10	4.07	4.21	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	5	3	6		4.16			4.21	4.16	4.25	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0					1152/1480		4.69	4.68	4.74	4.10
-		2	0	0										
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	U	U	2	12	тт	4.30	515/1450	4.47	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	14	15	4.34	957/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.34
	7	0	0	0	0	1								
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		-	-	-	-	_	31	4.97	200/1407		4.68	4.69	4.79	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	3	8		4.38	713/1399		4.28	4.26	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	9		4.66	433/1400			4.27	4.38	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	1	4	6	15	4.22	464/1179	4.17	3.95	3.96	4.07	4.22
Discussion	20	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	110/1060	/ 2E	2 00	4.05	4.33	4.42
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	1	2	3		4.42	418/1262		3.90		4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20		-			-			615/1259		4.24	4.29		4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74			4.30	4.30	4.60	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	213/ 788	4.37	3.89	4.00	4.26	4.41
T a bassa bassa														
Laboratory  2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	3.87	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 24)		1.10	7.11	3.07	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69		4.74	4.53	4.64	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 63		4.66	4.44	4.49	****
		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69					****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		,		4.52	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	****/ 68	* * * * *	4.04	3.92	4.10	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 59	****	F 00	4 20	4.93	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0		0		1	0				5.00	4.30		****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	U	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.56	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.86	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 31		4.14	4.75	5.00	****
2. Did beddy quebelons make crear the expected goar	30	O	O	U	O		O	1.00	, 51		1.11	1.75	3.00	
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	s Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 21		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	23
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4														
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 7 C 3		Ger	neral	L				5	Under-g	rad 3	9	Non-	major	16
84-150 11 3.00-3.49 7 D 0		_						_			_			_
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0	Electives 0 #### - Means there are							h						
P 0			202				_	1	respons	onses to be significant				
т 0		()+k	702				7							

Other

21

I

0

1

Course-Section: PSYC 446 8020 University of Maryland
Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 10

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1260

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Alonso, Diane Spring 2006
Enrollment: 14

					Frequencies						Inst	structor 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		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1481	4.44	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	399/1481		4.23	4.23	4.32	4.60
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	854/1249	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.10
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	334/1424		4.22	4.21	4.35	4.60
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1		4.00	707/1396		4.00	3.98	4.09	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4		4.20	592/1342		4.10	4.07	4.21	4.20
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	1	0	2	7		460/1459		4.21	4.16	4.25	4.50
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	10		1/1480		4.69	4.68	4.74	
	-			ning effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57			4.03			4.57
	-	_		3														
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well ;	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.80
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	567/1399	4.44	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.50
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	829/1400	4.48	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.30
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	2	0	0	0	7	4.11	549/1179	4.17	3.95	3.96	4.07	4.11
		Discus			_	_		_	_	_								
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	550/1262		3.90	4.05	4.33	4.29
				d to participate	3	-	0	0	0	2	5		402/1259		4.24	4.29	4.57	4.71
		_		d open discussion	3		0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256		4.30	4.30	4.60	4.86
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		3	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.37	3.89	4.00	4.26	4.33
				Frequ	ency	nist	trib	ıt i oı	n									
				11040	ciicy	DID	C1 1D	uc101										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
				P 1								respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
				I 0	Other					4								
				? 0	Conci													

Course-Section: PSYC 475 0101 University of Maryland Title CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Baltimore County Spring

Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT Enrollment: 45

Questionnaires: 35

re	County	JUN	13,	2006	
ng	2006	Job	IRBF	R3029	

Page 1261

Questionnaires:	35	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
				Frequ	uencies	

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	10	19	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	14	19	4.49	545/1481	4.49	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals			0	3	3	12	17	4.23	765/1249	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/1424	****	4.22	4.21	4.35	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	19	4.23	527/1396	4.23	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	31	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1342	****	4.10	4.07	4.21	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	0	11	24	4.69	253/1459	4.69	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	2	33	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	15	15	4.26	630/1450	4.26	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	304/1409	4.82	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	682/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.82
		0	0	0	1	10	23	4.65	404/1399	4.65	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.65
		0	0	0	3	5	26	4.68	409/1400	4.68	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	2	6	6	9	3.72	813/1179	3.72	3.95	3.96	4.07	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	9	15	4.06	687/1262	4.06	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	9	21	4.55	556/1259	4.55	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	1	1	4	11	16	4.21	797/1256	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.60	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful		27	3	0	2	0	0		****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.26	****
F				3	_	Ŭ	Ü		, , , , , ,		05			

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	29		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	18								
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	16	Under-grad	35	Non-major	6		
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	13	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n		
				P	0			responses to be significant					
				I	0	Other	19	-					
				?	0								

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101 Title

TOPICS IN SOC/HLTH PSY

Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1262 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	928/1481	4.19	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	5	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.23	4.23	4.32	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1048/1424	3.94	4.22	4.21	4.35	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	263/1396	4.56	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	845/1342	3.94	4.10	4.07	4.21	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	1	5	3.19	1352/1459	3.19	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1133/1480	4.38	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1005/1450	3.87	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	8	5	3	3.69	1267/1409	3.69	4.41	4.42	4.51	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1067/1400	3.94	4.26	4.27	4.38	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1174/1179	1.75	3.95	3.96	4.07	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	220/1262	4.73	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.67
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	151/1256		4.30	4.30	4.60	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	533/ 788	3.75	3.89	4.00	4.26	3.75

Credits E	E Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101 Uni

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Title SEM:VERBAL BEHAVIOR Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 12

Page 1263 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies					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	2	4	6	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	136/1396	4.75	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	603/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.92	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	6	4	1	0	2.55	1394/1409	2.55	4.41	4.42	4.36	2.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	2	4	1	3.08	1317/1399	3.08	4.28	4.26	4.16	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	2	1	1	2.33	1383/1400	2.33	4.26	4.27	4.17	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	4	4	3	0	2.91	1087/1179	2.91	3.95	3.96	3.81	2.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	797/1262	3.90	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	650/ 788	3.40	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.23	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.71	****

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601C 0101 University of Maryland QUALITATIVE METHODS

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Title BRODSKY, ANNE Instructor:

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Page 1264 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequen						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0		1253/1481	3.67	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1193/1249	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.24	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1316/1424	3.33	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.01	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	46/ 51	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.81	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	27/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.65	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	30/ 41	3.50	3.50	4.26	4.27	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	23/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.42	4.58	4.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ıt i or	า									

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101
Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE

INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE Baltimore County CARLTON, CHRIST Spring 2006

Instructor: CARLTON

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 1265 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1206/1481	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1383/1396	2.25	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	883/1399	4.20	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	913/1400	4.20	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	631/1262	4.17	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.40
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601E 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County STRUCTRL EQUATION MODE

Page 1266 Title JUN 13, 2006 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	8			
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					2 2			Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did wo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		m this sourse	Λ	0	0	0	0	Λ	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.28	5.00
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.11	4.57
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.86
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.16	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	3.86	839/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	3.86
	_	-		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342		4.10	4.07	4.18	5.00
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.86
		was class cance	_	ineq	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4		281/1450	4.57	4.03	4.09		4.57
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.86
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.86
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.50
		Discuss	ui on															
1 Did cla	ace diecu			what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	887/1262	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.75
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.50
				d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256		4.30	4.30	4.33	4.75
		chniques succes		a open arbeabbion	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	394/ 788		3.89	4.00	3.97	4.00
1	pcorar oc	Joining and Dadoon	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			_	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	3, 1, , 00	1.00	3.03	1.00	3.77	1.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 28-55	0 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 3 B 2		Red	<u>quir</u> e	ea I	Or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	5	Majo	or.	2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		061	ici a.	-				_	onder g	Luu	_	14011		5
Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

2

responses to be significant

1

0

0

I

?

Course-Section: PSYC 601F 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County DICLEMENTE, CAR

Spring 2006

Page 1267

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

CORE II

Quantida na							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	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 vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1187/1481	3.86	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.86
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	9	7	5		1221/1481		4.23	4.23	4.11	3.73
		uestions reflec		1 0	0	12	0	1	2	5	2		1022/1249		4.32	4.27	4.24	3.80
	_	uations reflect		_	2	5	0	0	7	6	2		1224/1424		4.22	4.21	4.16	3.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	649/1396	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.09
	_	_		o what you learned	0	2	0	1	7	9	3	3.70	1018/1342	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.70
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	2	5	5	1	7	3.30	1327/1459	3.30	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.30
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	839/1480	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.81
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	14	7	4.27	609/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.27
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	800/1409	4.48	4 41	4.42	4.36	4.48
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71			4.68	4.69	4.73	4.71
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	445/1399		4.28	4.26	4.16	4.62
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	729/1400		4.26	4.27	4.17	4.38
				our understanding	1	1	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	641/1179		3.95	3.96		3.95
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	laga diga			what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	418/1262	4.42	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.42
				d to participate	3		0	1	0	_	15	4.68	432/1259		4.24	4.29	4.30	4.68
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1		13	4.60	516/1256		4.30	4.30	4.33	4.60
		echniques succe		d open discussion	2	13	0	3	2	1	1		713/ 788				3.97	3.00
				_														
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trib	ut10	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	ре			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	guir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e 1	 L3	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6			-			-						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
Р 0													respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	nt	
		I 0					her				1	.9						
				? 2														

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1268

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 0101 University of Maryland Title CORE II Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

20

			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	1	4	8	5	3.94	1124/1481	3.94	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1036/1249	3.78	4.32	4.27	4.24	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	633/1396	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	1060/1342	3.63	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	2	3	6	3.28	1333/1459	3.28	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	567/1450	4.31	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	878/1409	4.41	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	919/1407	4.71	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	545/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	766/1400	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	0	2	11	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	Ο	0	3	2	11	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	294/1259	4.81	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	438/1256	4.69	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****
	J		,	J	,	_	_	55	, , , , , ,		2.02	00		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 0101 University of Maryland Page 1269 PHYSIO SYSTEMS Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 GLASGOW, MICHAE Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 8

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

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		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	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.86
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	790/1481	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.29
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.43
	_	uations reflect			0	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.20
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	707/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	4.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	1		1166/1342		4.10	4.07	4.18	3.40
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	131/1459		4.21	4.16	4.01	4.86
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480		4.69	4.68	4.74	
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	445/1450		4.03	4.09		4.43
J. 110 0	uru you	grade one evera	0000	ming clicociveness	Ū	Ü	Ü	Ü	ŭ	-		1.15	110/1100	11.15	1.05	1.05	3.70	1.15
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.57
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.86
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.57
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	5.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dico			what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.83
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.67
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.33	5.00
		echniques succe		d open discussion	1	5	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 788		3.89	4.00		****
4. Were s	peciai c	echniques succe	SSIUI			5	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	700		3.03	4.00	3.31	
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_				_	_	_				_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	Ι				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					5						

? 0

Course-Section: PSYC 604 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1270

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Title BIOL BASES OF BHVR DEV Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT Spring 2006

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								cquci	1010			1110	CIUCCOI	COULDC	DCPC	OFIDC	TC A CT	DCCC
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	2	3.86	1193/1481	3.86	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	6	6	1	3.43	1355/1481	3.43	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.43
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	865/1249	4.07	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.07
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	3	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.50
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	2	3	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.00
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	2	2	2.92	1296/1342	2.92	4.10	4.07	4.18	2.92
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	4	1	7	3.93	1030/1459	3.93	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.93
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	7	6	0	3.36	1280/1450	3.36	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.36
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	2	2	4	6	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	3.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	13		400/1407					
				explained clearly	0	0	3	2	3	5	1		1343/1399		4.28		4.16	
		es contribute t		-	0	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	953/1400	4.14	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.14
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	4	0	2.86	1183/1262	2.86	3.90	4.05	4.07	2.86
				ed to participate		0	0	2					1071/1259					
				d open discussion	1		1	1		4			1127/1256					
		echniques succe			0		0	1	0	1			****/ 788					
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
				1104		, 515	.0112	u0101	-									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	e 1	3	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her				1	.1	_					
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 616 0101

11

MEAS APPL BEHAV AN

RICHMAN, DAVID

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2006

Page 1271

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionn.	aire

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		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 n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	883/1481	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.22
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.44
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1424	4.56	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.56
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	126/1396	4.78	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.78
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	434/1342	4.38	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.38
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.33
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	863/1480	4.78	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.78
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.50
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.88
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1399	4.88	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.88
		es contribute t			1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	741/1400		4.26	4.27	4.17	4.38
				our understanding	1	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	972/1179		3.95	3.96		3.33
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	agg digo			what you learned	1	0	0	0	Ο	1	7	4.88	138/1262	4.88	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.88
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.30	5.00
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7		357/1256		4.30	4.30	4.33	4.75
		echniques succe		ia open arbeabbion	1	3	1	0	2	0	2		650/ 788		3.89	4.00		3.40
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_	1													
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	e	8	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-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1 respons				_	ŗh

Other

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: PSYC 621 0101 University of Maryland Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT Baltimore County

Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT Baltimore Count Instructor: MORAN, MARIANNE Spring 2006

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

	Evaluation	

Page 1272

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

O contribution in							Fre	_	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	 .l															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.2
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.6
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.6
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1424		4.22	4.21	4.16	5.0
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	241/1396	4.60	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.6
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80			4.10	4.07	4.18	4.8
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	344/1459		4.21	4.16	4.01	4.6
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.0
				ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.4
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	5.0
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1407		4.68	4.69	4.73	5.
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1399		4.28	4.26	4.16	5.
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.0
				your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1179		3.95		3.81	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.5
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2				4.24	4.29	4.30	4.5
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	773/1256		4.30	4.30	4.33	4.2
		echniques succe		•	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.3
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00 27	0	0.00.000		 л 1							. – – –		Cwadaat					 2
00-27 28-55	-	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 1 B 3		ked	quir	eu I	or Ma	Jors	5	0	Graduat	E	3	Majo	)T	2
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-1.99	0 0	C 0		0	nera	1				0	Under-q	~~d	2	Moss	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	1	D 0		Ger	uera.	т				U	onder-g	Lau	۷	NOI1-	-ıııa JOF	-
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	Б 0 F 0		וים	ecti	a				0	#### - 1	Moona t	horo a	ro not	000110	·h
Grau.	P 0					EIt	-CLI	ves				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					5	T CPFOIIP	CD CO L	c argii	ıııcaı.	10	
				Ι 0		ULI	rier					J						

Course-Section: PSYC 622 0101 University of Maryland Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN I

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1273

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

DELUTY, ROBERT Instructor: Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Stu	dent	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			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	1	0	5	3	4.11	996/1481	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1130/1481	3.89	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	573/1249	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1424	****	4.22	4.21	4.16	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	633/1396	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1342	****	4.10	4.07	4.18	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1409	4.89	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	245/1399	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	890/1400	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	1	2	3		1113/1259	3.44	4.24	4.29	4.30	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	3		1069/1256	3.67	4.30	4.30	4.33	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	278/ 788		3.89	4.00	3.97	
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Cuadita Baunad Cuadas Cuadas	_			Da		_			m				Ma	_
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке:	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	e	9	Majo	r	0

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

Course-Section: PSYC 646 0101 University of Maryland Title CLINICAL NEUROPSYCHOLO Baltimore County Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 1274

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

0

							Fre	equei	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 yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	487/1481	4.57	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.57
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.57
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.24	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	157/1424	4.86	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.86
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	839/1396	3.86	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.86
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	153/1342	4.71	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.71
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	580/1459	4.43	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.43
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	445/1450	4.43	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.43
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.43
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.86
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	311/1399	4.71	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.71
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.71
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.43	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.43
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.86
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.89	4.00	3.97	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ıtior	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 3								1	Graduat		3	Mo de		1
00-27 28-55	0	1.00-0.99	0	A 3 B 1		ке	quire	eu ro	שניי ועונ	ajors	j.	1	Graduat	=	3	Majo	Σ	1
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cos	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Gei	nera.	L				4	under-g.	Lau	7	MOI1-	-ma Jor	O
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		וים	ectiv	700				2	#### - 1	Moona t	horo a	vo not	onous	rh
Grau.	3	3.30-4.00	_	P 0		₽.T.¢	CCLI	765				4	respons				_	111
				I 0		<b>∩</b> +1	her					0	T CPFOIIS	a LU L	c sign	ııı.cal.	10	
				T 0		ULI	ner					U						

Course-Section: PSYC 650 0101 Title

CHILD CLINICL PSYCHOLO

Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1275 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	5	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	435/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	Λ	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400		4.26	4.27	4.17	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262		3.90	4.05	4.07	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	516/1256		4.30	4.30	4.33	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.84	4.49	4.23	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.74	4.53	4.46	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	28/ 63	4.67	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	34/ 69	4.60	4.52	4.35	4.16	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	30/ 68	4.40	4.04	3.92	3.71	4.40
_														

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

Course-Section: PSYC 656 0101 University of Maryl Title APPLIED SOCIAL PSYC Baltimore County Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS Spring 2006

Ρ

I

0

0

3

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

13

University of Maryland Page 1276
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

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

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did	. aain n	General ew insights,skil	_	om this source	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	2 20	1426/1481	3.20	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.20
		ew insights,skii ctor make clear			0	0	0	3	∠ 1	4	1		1412/1481		4.24	4.29	4.28	3.20
		uestions reflect		_	1	6	0	0	2	0	1		1081/1249		4.23	4.23	4.11	3.67
	_	uations reflect			0	6	0	0	2	0	7	4.00	959/1424		4.22	4.21	4.16	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	959/1424		4.22	3.98	4.10	3.70
	_	_		to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	1		1115/1342		4.10	4.07	4.18	3.50
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	6	0	1	3		1369/1459		4.10	4.16	4.01	3.10
		y system clearly was class cance		ained	0	0	0	0	0	_	10	5.00	1/1480		4.69	4.16	4.74	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	4	1	1		1338/1450		4.03	4.00		3.13
9. HOW WO	ura you g	grade the overal	.i tead	ching effectiveness	Т	1	U	2	4	Т	1	3.13	1336/1430	3.13	4.03	4.09	3.90	3.13
		Lecture	ž															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	-	prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407		4.68	4.69	4.73	4.70
				explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	4	1		1260/1399		4.28	4.26	4.16	3.40
		es contribute to			0	0	0	4	0	4	2		1256/1400		4.26	4.27	4.17	3.40
				your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	3	3		827/1179		3.95	3.96		3.70
		1,000											,					
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1223/1262	2.50	3.90	4.05	4.07	2.50
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	2	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.24	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage f	air ar	nd open discussion	2	0	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1162/1256	3.13	4.30	4.30	4.33	3.13
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sful	_	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	า									
					2													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 S	1	Graduat	 e	7	Majo	r r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t		re not	enoug	βh

Other

Course-Section: PSYC 686 0101 University of Maryland Page 1277
Title ETHICAL & PRO ISSUES Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: BARNETT, JEFF Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16					
Ouestionnaires:	13		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		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	3	10	4.77	280/1481	4.77	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.77
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	286/1481		4.23	4.23	4.11	4.69
		uestions reflec			2	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	451/1249	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.56
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.46
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1104/1396	3.46	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	283/1342	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.54
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.38
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1480	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.69
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.33
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	633/1409	4.62	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.62
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407		4.68	4.69	4.73	4.92
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1399	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.85
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	480/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.62
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	671/1179	3.92	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.92
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.00
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	6				4.24	4.29	4.30	4.60
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	680/1256			4.30	4.33	4.40
		echniques succe		-	3	6	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	3 d	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Das	asons	_			m				M	
credits E	sarned	Cum. GPA	·	Expected Grades					asons	∍ 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	9	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		-						_						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1278

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: PSYC 695A 0101

Questionnaires: 12

DIVERSITY

Title

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1018/1481	4.08	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	1		1160/1481	3.83	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	0		****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	2		1248/1424	3.58	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	987/1342	3.75	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1233/1459	3.58	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	2	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.26	4.27	4.17	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	4	5	1	3.25	997/1179	3.25	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	524/1259	4.58	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	527/1256	4.58	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	574/ 788	3.64	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.64
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1279

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 710 0101

RESEARCH METHODS

MURPHY, CHRISTO

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	equei	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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1347/1481	3.54	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.54
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	2	4	2	1	4	3.08	1414/1481	3.08	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.08
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	***
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1303/1424	3.38	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.38
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	3	3.62	1018/1396	3.62	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.62
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	1	6	3.85	927/1342	3.85	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.85
		g system clearl		_	0	0	3	4	2	2	2	2.69	1417/1459	2.69	4.21	4.16	4.01	2.69
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	1	3	1	4	2	3.27	1301/1450		4.03		3.96	3.27
		Tash	_															
1 Wome +	-ho inata	Lectur uctor's lecture	_	nanarad	0	0	2	2	2	1	2	2 21	1332/1409	3.31	4.41	4.42	4.36	3.31
		ctor's lecture			0	0	2	2	2	2	2		1375/1409		4.41	4.42	4.73	3.46
				explained clearly	0	0	1	4	2	2	5		13/5/140/		4.08	4.69	4.16	3.40
		_		-	0	0	3	2	1	3	3 1		1297/1399		4.28		4.17	3.23
		es contribute t		-	-	-	3	∠ 1	Τ	_	4		,			4.27		3.∠3 ****
5. Did au	adiovisua.	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	10	0	Τ	0	1	0	3.00	****/1179	***	3.95	3.96	3.81	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	2	3	0	2	1	2.63	1210/1262	2.63	3.90	4.05	4.07	2.63
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	1	4	0	1	2	2.88	1190/1259	2.88	4.24	4.29	4.30	2.88
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	5	0	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1206/1256	2.75	4.30	4.30	4.33	2.75
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		5	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons	,			Ty	ne			Majors	,
				Expected Grades						· - – –			ту.					, 
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	7	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her				1	.3						

? 1

Course-Section: PSYC 711 0101 University of Maryland Title DATA ANALYTIC PROCED I Baltimore County

Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1280 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	113/1249	4.93	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	302/1424	4.64	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	156/1396	4.71	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	231/1450	4.64	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	3.81	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	Ο	Ο	0	0	2	5 00	****/1262	****	3.90	4.05	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1259	****	4.24	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1256		4.30	4.30	4.33	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	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	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 711L 0101

Title DATA ANALY. PROCED. II

PITTS, STEVEN C Instructor:

Enrollment:

Spring 2006 14 Questionnaires: 13

Page 1281 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Studen	t Course	Evaluatio	on Questi	lonna:	ire
--------	----------	-----------	-----------	--------	-----

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	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 you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	Ο	4	5	2	3 92	1152/1481	3.92	4 24	4.29	4.28	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	- ,	4.08	4.23	4.23		4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50		4.50	4.32	4.27		4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	2	2		1138/1424	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57		4.57	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	4		190/1342	4.67	4.10	4.07		4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	0	1	4	_		1236/1459	3.57	4.21	4.16		3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	2	9		1029/1480		4.69	4.68		4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	3.38	1272/1450	3.38	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.38
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1296/1407	4.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1219/1400	3.55	4.26	4.27	4.17	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	526/1179	4.14	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	****	3.90	4.05	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1259	****	4.24	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.30	4.30	4.33	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	3.93	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	3.73	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	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	4	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Course-Section: PSYC 721 0101 Page 1282 ASSESSMENT JUN 13, 2006 SONNENSCHEIN, S Job IRBR3029 6

			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	0	0	4	2	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.00
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1318/1459	3.33	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1130/1399	3.83	4.28	4.26	4.16	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	937/1400	4.17	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.90	4.05	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	****	4.24	4.29	4.30	****

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 730 0101

PARENTING

9

CHEAH, CHARISSA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Page 1283 JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eauei	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
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	708/1481	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	822/1481		4.23	4.23	4.11	4.25
		uestions reflec			0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249		4.32	4.27	4.24	4.50
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1424		4.22	4.21	4.16	4.38
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	403/1396		4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	542/1342		4.10	4.07	4.18	4.25
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.50	- , -		4.21	4.16	4.01	
		was class canc		221100	1	0	0	0	1	6	0		1427/1480		4.69	4.68	4.74	3.86
				ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2		599/1450		4.03			4.29
		Lectur	۵															
Were t	he instri	uctor's lecture	_	nrenared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.71
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407		4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71			4.28	4.26	4.16	4.71
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	681/1400		4.26	4.27	4.17	
				your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	323/1179		3.95	3.96	3.81	
. Did au	.uIOVISUA.	r techniques en	nance y	your understanding		U	U	U	1	2	4	4.43	323/11/3	4.43	3.95	3.90	3.01	4.43
		Discus									_		0.45 /4.05					
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	345/1262		3.90	4.05	4.07	4.50
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259		4.24	4.29	4.30	5.00
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256		4.30	4.30	4.33	4.83
. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	89/ 788	4.80	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.80
		Semina	r															
. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.23	****
. Was th	e instru	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.46	****
. Did re	search p	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	***
. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.16	***
. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.71	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	;
00-27	2 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5 B 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	e	4	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0			a		1				6	IInda-	d	1	NT	mo =	0
56-83	-	2.00-2.99	1			Gei	nera	Т				6	Under-g	rau	4	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49		- *		m.7						0	пппп	Maana t	. h			-la
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		ΕI	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	111
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	oe sign	uiican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					1						
				2 0														

0