

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	2	9	13	22	4.20	959/1522	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.14	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	6	5	20	15	3.96	1135/1522	4.21	4.20	4.26	4.18	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	2	1	10	13	20	4.04	915/1285	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.22	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	21	2	2	6	11	4	3.52	1315/1476	3.96	4.14	4.22	4.09	3.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	4	6	8	26	4.20	621/1412	4.32	4.09	4.06	4.01	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	29	1	1	6	2	6	3.69	1086/1381	3.88	4.09	4.08	3.93	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	1	5	22	17	4.15	882/1500	4.25	4.17	4.18	4.16	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	0	1	3	41	4.89	532/1517	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	3	12	17	5	3.65	1215/1497	4.08	4.08	4.11	4.02	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	3	7	11	23	4.23	1071/1440	4.56	4.47	4.45	4.40	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	4	5	35	4.70	954/1448	4.80	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	3	9	9	22	4.09	1008/1436	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	5	3	7	12	17	3.75	1191/1432	4.26	4.30	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	6	4	15	18	4.05	592/1221	4.26	4.09	3.93	3.86	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	3	2	3	4	6	3.44	1061/1280	3.77	4.08	4.10	3.92	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	4	5	4	6	3.63	1103/1277	4.04	4.34	4.34	4.13	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	832/1269	4.28	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	12	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	****/ 854	3.55	3.86	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 108
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1245
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	55	Non-major	53
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	14	26	47	4.33	825/1522	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	2	15	30	42	4.22	904/1522	4.21	4.20	4.26	4.18	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	2	5	8	29	46	4.24	773/1285	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.22	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	31	1	3	10	19	26	4.12	945/1476	3.96	4.14	4.22	4.09	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	0	2	12	16	53	4.45	393/1412	4.32	4.09	4.06	4.01	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	41	0	2	8	16	21	4.19	663/1381	3.88	4.09	4.08	3.93	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	0	11	31	45	4.35	680/1500	4.25	4.17	4.18	4.16	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	3	0	0	0	8	76	4.90	487/1517	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	3	0	2	17	32	21	4.00	898/1497	4.08	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	17	66	4.73	492/1440	4.56	4.47	4.45	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	4	10	71	4.76	859/1448	4.80	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	7	26	52	4.50	601/1436	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	3	8	21	52	4.41	745/1432	4.26	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	3	7	15	58	4.54	252/1221	4.26	4.09	3.93	3.86	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	62	0	4	2	10	7	10	3.52	1026/1280	3.77	4.08	4.10	3.92	3.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	4	1	6	7	15	3.85	1035/1277	4.04	4.34	4.34	4.13	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	62	0	3	0	6	9	15	4.00	875/1269	4.28	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	62	17	3	1	4	5	3	3.25	****/ 854	3.55	3.86	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	90	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	91	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	92	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	91	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.28	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	94	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	94	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	94	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	24	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors	35
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 36		Graduate 0
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 16	C 15	General	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 15	D 1		Under-grad 95
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 1	Electives	5
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 99
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1247
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	27	4.59	514/1522	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.14	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	13	22	4.46	607/1522	4.21	4.20	4.26	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	17	17	4.28	745/1285	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.22	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	4	12	13	4.23	815/1476	3.96	4.14	4.22	4.09	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	6	7	22	4.32	502/1412	4.32	4.09	4.06	4.01	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	1	1	0	9	2	3.77	1040/1381	3.88	4.09	4.08	3.93	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	5	10	21	4.23	799/1500	4.25	4.17	4.18	4.16	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	749/1517	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	16	23	4.59	326/1497	4.08	4.08	4.11	4.02	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	29	4.71	532/1440	4.56	4.47	4.45	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	296/1448	4.80	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	11	26	4.63	446/1436	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	29	4.63	490/1432	4.26	4.30	4.29	4.23	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	2	13	16	4.21	493/1221	4.26	4.09	3.93	3.86	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	8	12	4.36	507/1280	3.77	4.08	4.10	3.92	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	498/1277	4.04	4.34	4.34	4.13	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	0	3	18	4.68	445/1269	4.28	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	11	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	664/ 854	3.55	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 99
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1247
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	40	Non-major	35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	6	11	15	4.28	869/1522	4.25	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	3	10	9	10	3.81	1238/1522	4.14	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	4	9	12	7	3.69	1117/1285	4.02	4.21	4.30	4.36	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	2	1	2	9	13	4	3.59	1289/1476	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	3	8	8	8	3.50	1165/1412	4.07	4.09	4.06	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	4	0	5	10	8	3	3.35	1223/1381	3.47	4.09	4.08	3.97	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	6	10	13	4.24	789/1500	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1517	4.75	4.75	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	4	18	4	3.93	1006/1497	3.92	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	492/1440	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	602/1448	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	539/1436	4.47	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	8	2	19	4.38	784/1432	4.31	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	1	5	5	19	4.40	359/1221	4.40	4.09	3.93	4.02	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	4	6	4	6	3.36	1095/1280	3.71	4.08	4.10	4.08	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	827/1277	4.31	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	628/1269	4.42	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	12	1	1	5	1	2	3.20	****/ 854	3.25	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 41
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0		Non-major 30
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	16
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	7	12	26	4.23	929/1522	4.25	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	15	24	4.29	834/1522	4.14	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	3	5	7	30	4.28	752/1285	4.02	4.21	4.30	4.36	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	4	3	5	10	9	3.55	1306/1476	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	5	8	32	4.38	457/1412	4.07	4.09	4.06	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	5	1	6	7	8	3.44	1179/1381	3.47	4.09	4.08	3.97	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	11	33	4.52	463/1500	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	36	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	4	7	17	9	3.76	1140/1497	3.92	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	15	28	4.56	740/1440	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	0	0	9	34	4.62	1048/1448	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	18	22	4.30	825/1436	4.47	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	3	11	26	4.20	928/1432	4.31	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	6	13	23	4.15	532/1221	4.40	4.09	3.93	4.02	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	2	7	5	10	3.63	978/1280	3.71	4.08	4.10	4.08	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	0	4	9	12	4.07	911/1277	4.31	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	2	6	7	12	3.96	909/1269	4.42	4.35	4.31	4.33	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	7	5	2	1	7	5	3.25	741/ 854	3.25	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.25	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.57	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 116
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1249
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	49	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0301
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 90
 Questionnaires: 90

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1250
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	42	0	0	2	4	22	20	4.25	899/1522	4.25	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	42	0	0	2	3	21	22	4.31	811/1522	4.14	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	43	0	1	3	9	12	22	4.09	893/1285	4.02	4.21	4.30	4.36	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	42	13	0	2	2	17	14	4.23	827/1476	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	2	7	12	27	4.33	493/1412	4.07	4.09	4.06	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	43	12	3	3	7	13	9	3.63	1119/1381	3.47	4.09	4.08	3.97	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	42	0	0	4	6	16	22	4.17	871/1500	4.31	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	44	0	0	0	0	23	23	4.50	1080/1517	4.75	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	55	0	0	1	6	17	11	4.09	846/1497	3.92	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	42	0	0	1	3	5	39	4.71	552/1440	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	42	0	0	0	1	6	41	4.83	683/1448	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	0	1	5	9	33	4.54	551/1436	4.47	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	2	7	7	30	4.34	811/1432	4.31	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	0	0	0	4	9	35	4.65	187/1221	4.40	4.09	3.93	4.02	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	66	0	2	0	4	5	13	4.13	670/1280	3.71	4.08	4.10	4.08	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	66	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	508/1277	4.31	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	66	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	299/1269	4.42	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	66	8	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	****/ 854	3.25	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	88	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	89	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	89	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	8
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1251
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	15	2	3.59	1368/1522	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	11	8	3.85	1217/1522	4.25	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	10	4.11	873/1285	4.41	4.21	4.30	4.36	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	1324/1476	3.99	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	9	10	4.00	760/1412	3.64	4.09	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1381	****	4.09	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	190/1500	4.84	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	600/1517	4.91	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	12	3	4	3.58	1250/1497	3.94	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	798/1440	4.69	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	765/1448	4.83	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	5	10	6	3.62	1257/1436	4.19	4.31	4.29	4.29	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	6	7	3.38	1309/1432	4.11	4.30	4.29	4.31	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	5	3	5	8	3.52	891/1221	4.05	4.09	3.93	4.02	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	7	2	5	3.28	1126/1280	3.61	4.08	4.10	4.08	3.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	4	4	7	3.78	1059/1277	3.89	4.34	4.34	4.33	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	4	3	8	3.78	1019/1269	4.13	4.35	4.31	4.33	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	12	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	12	25	4.44	681/1522	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	31	4.65	371/1522	4.25	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	8	32	4.71	318/1285	4.41	4.21	4.30	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	519/1476	3.99	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	10	5	5	7	15	3.29	1278/1412	3.64	4.09	4.06	4.00	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	37	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1381	****	4.09	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	109/1500	4.84	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	146/1517	4.91	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	3	15	17	4.31	602/1497	3.94	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	37	4.88	224/1440	4.69	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	37	4.86	629/1448	4.83	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	33	4.76	279/1436	4.19	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	36	4.83	254/1432	4.11	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	11	27	4.59	226/1221	4.05	4.09	3.93	4.02	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	2	4	2	10	3.95	782/1280	3.61	4.08	4.10	4.08	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	2	4	1	11	4.00	930/1277	3.89	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	611/1269	4.13	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	14	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.57	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 28	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	D 0		44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	35

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	22	54	4.67	433/1522	4.58	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	30	45	4.54	511/1522	4.60	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	5	6	21	45	4.38	674/1285	4.60	4.21	4.30	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	58	1	2	6	1	9	3.79	****/1476	4.14	4.14	4.22	4.20	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	9	21	40	4.41	430/1412	4.23	4.09	4.06	4.00	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	67	0	3	1	1	4	3.67	****/1381	3.85	4.09	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	6	18	53	4.61	374/1500	4.65	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	9	64	4	3.94	1431/1517	4.48	4.75	4.65	4.63	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	5	25	33	4.44	457/1497	4.45	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	30	42	4.44	891/1440	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	70	4.90	521/1448	4.91	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	25	47	4.55	539/1436	4.73	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	14	59	4.69	430/1432	4.78	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	24	3	6	11	14	18	3.73	797/1221	4.36	4.09	3.93	4.02	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	2	7	6	24	4.33	530/1280	4.02	4.08	4.10	4.08	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	1	3	5	6	24	4.26	804/1277	4.07	4.34	4.34	4.33	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	3	5	4	27	4.41	662/1269	4.05	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	32	3	1	0	1	2	2.71	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE
 Enrollment: 151
 Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1253
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	37						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	12	C	8	General	14	Under-grad	79	Non-major	59
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 87
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1254
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	13	32	4.51	605/1522	4.58	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	16	33	4.61	432/1522	4.60	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	15	35	4.67	366/1285	4.60	4.21	4.30	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	32	2	1	2	7	7	3.84	1155/1476	4.14	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	3	19	20	4.22	594/1412	4.23	4.09	4.06	4.00	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	35	2	1	2	7	4	3.63	1119/1381	3.85	4.09	4.08	3.97	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	13	34	4.62	362/1500	4.65	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	21	29	4.55	1045/1517	4.48	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	19	19	4.33	582/1497	4.45	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	9	38	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	44	4.86	602/1448	4.91	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	12	39	4.76	279/1436	4.73	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	42	4.80	294/1432	4.78	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	6	10	33	4.50	279/1221	4.36	4.09	3.93	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	****/1280	4.02	4.08	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	****/1277	4.07	4.34	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	****/1269	4.05	4.35	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	39	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	21	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	16
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 4	C 5	General	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 8	D 0	Under-grad	51
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	5	9	31	4.58	525/1522	4.58	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	9	33	4.64	383/1522	4.60	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	8	36	4.76	278/1285	4.60	4.21	4.30	4.36	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	2	4	6	24	4.44	566/1476	4.14	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	5	12	22	4.04	734/1412	4.23	4.09	4.06	4.00	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	5	3	1	4	13	18	4.08	768/1381	3.85	4.09	4.08	3.97	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	6	37	4.72	252/1500	4.65	4.17	4.18	4.20	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	44	4.96	244/1517	4.48	4.75	4.65	4.63	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	15	25	4.59	326/1497	4.45	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	39	4.91	192/1440	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	42	4.98	148/1448	4.91	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	39	4.88	141/1436	4.73	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	0	3	38	4.86	227/1432	4.78	4.30	4.29	4.31	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	2	2	36	4.85	88/1221	4.36	4.09	3.93	4.02	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	5	0	1	0	11	3.71	941/1280	4.02	4.08	4.10	4.08	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	2	2	2	1	10	3.88	1020/1277	4.07	4.34	4.34	4.33	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	3	2	1	1	9	3.69	1066/1269	4.05	4.35	4.31	4.33	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	14	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1255
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	28	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	49	Non-major	46
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 305 0101
 Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 128
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1256
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	2	13	25	43	4.24	919/1522	4.24	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	3	15	22	41	4.21	925/1522	4.21	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	7	10	23	43	4.19	809/1285	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	11	2	2	10	25	35	4.20	850/1476	4.20	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	3	12	25	44	4.31	520/1412	4.31	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	45	2	3	10	9	15	3.82	1000/1381	3.82	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	6	17	61	4.65	325/1500	4.65	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	16	67	4.81	714/1517	4.81	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	1	3	10	32	28	4.12	807/1497	4.12	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	2	3	15	64	4.64	643/1440	4.64	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	7	77	4.89	521/1448	4.89	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	2	8	24	47	4.31	825/1436	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	4	10	16	55	4.44	720/1432	4.44	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	2	5	21	57	4.56	239/1221	4.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	4	15	14	35	4.09	690/1280	4.09	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	3	11	4	52	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	2	3	9	11	45	4.34	714/1269	4.34	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	6	1	1	7	19	36	4.38	267/ 854	4.38	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 33	Required for Majors	6
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 4	B 35		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 13	C 6	General	20
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 17	D 1		Under-grad 91
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives	7
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	40
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	9	10	16	4.14	1022/1522	4.14	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	7	12	16	4.19	935/1522	4.19	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	11	20	4.36	682/1285	4.36	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	3	5	7	15	4.13	924/1476	4.13	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	9	7	16	4.03	747/1412	4.03	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	10	9	12	3.91	938/1381	3.91	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	9	19	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	13	13	6	3.73	1167/1497	3.73	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	5	10	17	4.24	1063/1440	4.24	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	9	25	4.69	977/1448	4.69	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	5	10	16	4.15	972/1436	4.15	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	7	9	19	4.34	811/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	2	3	7	15	4.30	436/1221	4.30	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	825/1280	3.91	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1046/1277	3.82	4.34	4.34	4.38	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	997/1269	3.82	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	24
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	2
				General	5
				Electives	2
				Other	24
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	39
				Major	4
				Non-major	35
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PSYC 317 8020
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1258
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	18	4.52	593/1522	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	4.68	346/1522	4.68	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	488/1285	4.55	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	12	16	4.47	375/1412	4.47	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	392/1381	4.45	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	221/1500	4.74	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	195/1517	4.97	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	272/1497	4.65	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	240/1440	4.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	198/1448	4.97	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	4.71	373/1436	4.71	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	327/1432	4.77	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	9	20	4.58	226/1221	4.58	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	19	4.39	492/1280	4.39	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	4	24	4.65	489/1277	4.65	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	3	25	4.68	453/1269	4.68	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 317 8020
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1258
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	31	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSEME
 Instructor: MARTINKOWSKI, K
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1259
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	707/1522	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	419/1522	4.26	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	456/1285	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	347/1476	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	12	4.14	663/1412	4.07	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	2	0	0	3	7	4.08	763/1381	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	312/1500	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	873/1517	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	312/1497	4.01	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	272/1440	4.59	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	296/1448	4.98	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	170/1436	4.43	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	418/1432	4.18	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	532/1221	3.45	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	553/1280	4.05	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	442/1277	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	371/1269	4.58	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	9	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 23	Non-major 17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	15	
				?	0			

Course-Section: PSYC 320 8020
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME
 Instructor: ALLEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1260
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1269/1522	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1190/1522	4.26	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1065/1285	4.19	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	792/1476	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	760/1412	4.07	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	4.21	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	988/1500	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1315/1497	4.01	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	984/1440	4.59	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	4.98	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.43	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1224/1432	4.18	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1133/1221	3.45	4.09	3.93	3.94	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	874/1280	4.05	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	766/1277	4.50	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	671/1269	4.58	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	0			

Course-Section: PSYC 324 0101
 Title INTRO INTERVIEW TECHN
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1261
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	9	5	10	3.68	1334/1522	3.68	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	6	6	3.29	1432/1522	3.29	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	478/1285	4.56	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	7	7	10	3.96	1056/1476	3.96	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	8	6	6	3.44	1201/1412	3.44	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	5	6	12	3.86	977/1381	3.86	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	9	6	4	2.96	1437/1500	2.96	4.17	4.18	4.13	2.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	668/1517	4.82	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	3	7	7	4	3.45	1301/1497	3.45	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	6	9	8	3.70	1322/1440	3.70	4.47	4.45	4.46	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	5	3	18	4.37	1253/1448	4.37	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	5	10	7	3.63	1254/1436	3.63	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	5	7	9	3.65	1227/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	4	1	4	5	5	3.32	991/1221	3.32	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	547/1277	4.57	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 330 0101
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1262
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	478/1285	4.56	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	454/1476	4.52	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	14	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	11	13	4.30	565/1381	4.30	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	134/1500	4.85	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	8	15	4.54	355/1497	4.54	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.47	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	170/1436	4.85	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	280/1432	4.81	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	181/1221	4.65	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	3	15	4.33	530/1280	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	328/1277	4.79	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	112/1269	4.96	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	1	7	3	9	3.86	547/ 854	3.86	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: SULLIVAN, COLLE
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1263
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	7	4.11	1054/1522	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	750/1522	4.69	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	759/1285	4.64	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	924/1476	4.51	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	2	4	6	3.50	1165/1412	4.06	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	663/1381	4.37	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	463/1500	4.62	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	5	13	4.53	1062/1517	4.81	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	5	8	1	3.53	1265/1497	4.30	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	2	14	4.47	837/1440	4.73	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	1097/1448	4.82	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	4	2	9	3.89	1165/1436	4.52	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	942/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	4	2	0	3	9	3.61	855/1221	4.15	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	988/1280	4.11	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1072/1277	4.25	4.34	4.34	4.38	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1074/1269	4.27	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	726/ 854	3.85	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	194/ 215	4.04	3.69	4.36	4.21	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	83/ 228	4.52	4.04	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	123/ 217	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	90/ 216	4.70	4.12	4.42	4.35	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 205	4.70	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: SULLIVAN, COLLE
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1263
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 86
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1264
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	25	4.76	320/1522	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	211/1522	4.69	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	278/1285	4.64	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	336/1476	4.51	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	19	4.48	357/1412	4.06	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	280/1381	4.37	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	211/1500	4.62	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	195/1517	4.81	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	181/1497	4.30	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	256/1440	4.73	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	346/1448	4.82	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	160/1436	4.52	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	305/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	1	4	18	4.38	373/1221	4.15	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	4	16	4.22	605/1280	4.11	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	692/1277	4.25	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	516/1269	4.27	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	352/ 854	3.85	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	109/ 215	4.04	3.69	4.36	4.21	4.42	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	77/ 228	4.52	4.04	4.35	4.29	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	55/ 217	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.45	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	75/ 216	4.70	4.12	4.42	4.35	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	38/ 205	4.70	3.82	4.23	4.26	4.70	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1265
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	3	25	4.70	404/1522	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	128/1522	4.69	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	150/1285	4.64	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	216/1476	4.51	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	3	7	14	4.19	621/1412	4.06	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	7	15	4.35	507/1381	4.37	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	22	4.57	425/1500	4.62	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	341/1517	4.81	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	6	17	4.58	326/1497	4.30	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	272/1440	4.73	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	198/1448	4.82	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	198/1436	4.52	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	187/1432	4.62	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	311/1221	4.15	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	390/1280	4.11	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	517/1277	4.25	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	547/1269	4.27	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	426/ 854	3.85	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 215	4.04	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 228	4.52	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 217	4.66	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 216	4.70	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 205	4.70	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 26
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C 9	General 2	Under-grad 30	Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 25		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1266
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	4	11	15	7	3.68	1334/1522	3.56	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	6	8	13	8	3.51	1360/1522	3.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	12	15	7	3.68	1120/1285	3.68	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	2	3	13	17	4.19	860/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	3	6	16	7	3.60	1112/1412	3.62	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	6	12	18	4.33	519/1381	4.07	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	6	11	13	3.75	1183/1500	3.58	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	8	22	4	3.88	1049/1497	3.55	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	5	11	19	4.27	1031/1440	3.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	9	28	4.76	859/1448	4.27	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	5	7	13	10	3.65	1247/1436	3.58	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	10	19	4.19	935/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	6	1	3	7	6	3.26	1008/1221	3.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	8	4	11	3.70	941/1280	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	3	3	5	15	4.11	897/1277	3.98	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	4	8	12	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	2	6	3	5	4	3.15	759/ 854	3.16	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.15	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	40
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	31
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1267
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	4	11	15	7	3.68	1334/1522	3.56	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	6	8	13	8	3.51	1360/1522	3.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	12	15	7	3.68	1120/1285	3.68	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	2	3	13	17	4.19	860/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	3	6	16	7	3.60	1112/1412	3.62	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	6	12	18	4.33	519/1381	4.07	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	6	11	13	3.75	1183/1500	3.58	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	2	1	6	6	2	3.29	1358/1497	3.55	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	4	2	2	5	5	3.28	1392/1440	3.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	2	1	2	5	8	3.89	1387/1448	4.27	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	4	2	2	6	3	3.12	1371/1436	3.58	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	3	0	6	1	8	3.61	1239/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	871/1221	3.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	8	4	11	3.70	941/1280	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	3	3	5	15	4.11	897/1277	3.98	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	4	8	12	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	2	6	3	5	4	3.15	759/ 854	3.16	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.15	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	31
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1268
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	4	11	15	7	3.68	1334/1522	3.56	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	6	8	13	8	3.51	1360/1522	3.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	12	15	7	3.68	1120/1285	3.68	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	2	3	13	17	4.19	860/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	3	6	16	7	3.60	1112/1412	3.62	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	6	12	18	4.33	519/1381	4.07	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	6	11	13	3.75	1183/1500	3.58	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	2	2	7	7	0	3.06	1414/1497	3.55	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	4	6	4	4	3.32	1388/1440	3.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1353/1448	4.27	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	3	2	6	6	2	3.11	1373/1436	3.58	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	1	5	2	7	3.37	1313/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1024/1221	3.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	8	4	11	3.70	941/1280	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	3	3	5	15	4.11	897/1277	3.98	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	4	8	12	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	2	6	3	5	4	3.15	759/ 854	3.16	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.15	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	31
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1269
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	4	11	15	7	3.68	1334/1522	3.56	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	6	8	13	8	3.51	1360/1522	3.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	12	15	7	3.68	1120/1285	3.68	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	2	3	13	17	4.19	860/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	3	6	16	7	3.60	1112/1412	3.62	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	6	12	18	4.33	519/1381	4.07	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	6	11	13	3.75	1183/1500	3.58	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	645/1517	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	4	12	10	4.11	820/1497	3.55	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	2	6	3	14	4.16	1112/1440	3.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	1241/1448	4.27	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	6	8	10	4.04	1034/1436	3.58	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	6	3	12	3.96	1081/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	5	1	3	5	6	4	3.47	916/1221	3.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	8	4	11	3.70	941/1280	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	3	3	5	15	4.11	897/1277	3.98	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	4	8	12	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	2	6	3	5	4	3.15	759/ 854	3.16	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.15	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 40
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	31
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1270
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	15	6	8	3.56	1379/1522	3.56	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	10	7	9	3.59	1327/1522	3.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	13	10	3.88	1038/1285	3.68	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	12	11	4.10	961/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	10	6	7	3.38	1239/1412	3.62	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	11	11	3.97	858/1381	4.07	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	5	10	9	3.70	1219/1500	3.58	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	577/1517	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	6	11	7	2	3.19	1388/1497	3.55	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	9	7	14	4.10	1151/1440	3.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	11	7	9	3.65	1413/1448	4.27	4.71	4.71	4.71	3.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	8	7	8	8	3.52	1279/1436	3.58	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	11	6	8	3.45	1287/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	4	8	8	7	3.48	910/1221	3.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	4	5	7	6	3.46	1056/1280	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	5	5	6	7	3.54	1126/1277	3.98	4.34	4.34	4.38	3.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	4	10	7	3.79	1007/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	14	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	771/ 854	3.16	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	3.14	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 228	3.48	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 217	4.14	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 216	3.83	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 205	3.46	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	3.83	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	3.67	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1270
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ALLEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1271
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	13	13	3	3	2.58	1508/1522	3.56	4.27	4.30	4.34	2.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	10	12	10	3	3.00	1481/1522	3.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	8	8	10	8	3.26	1222/1285	3.68	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	13	7	10	6	3.13	1404/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	8	8	11	6	3.25	1287/1412	3.62	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	14	9	6	3.21	1254/1381	4.07	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	21	7	3	5	2	1.95	1491/1500	3.58	4.17	4.18	4.13	1.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	11	26	4.70	891/1517	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	3	5	17	2	0	2.67	1469/1497	3.55	4.08	4.11	4.13	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	10	13	8	3.57	1350/1440	3.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	14	19	4.35	1262/1448	4.27	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	6	10	11	5	3.14	1368/1436	3.58	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	10	8	8	2	2.61	1395/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	2.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	3	2	3	1	0	2.22	****/1221	3.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	7	6	4	1	2.84	1231/1280	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.14	2.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	5	7	1	6	3.42	1164/1277	3.98	4.34	4.34	4.38	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	4	6	3	6	3.58	1103/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	9	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	822/ 854	3.16	3.86	4.02	4.00	2.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	1	3	7	4	3	3.28	209/ 215	3.14	3.69	4.36	4.21	3.28	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	2	1	8	3	4	3.33	219/ 228	3.48	4.04	4.35	4.29	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	4	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	166/ 217	4.14	4.40	4.51	4.45	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	2	2	4	7	3	3.39	200/ 216	3.83	4.12	4.42	4.35	3.39	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	2	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	192/ 205	3.46	3.82	4.23	4.26	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 38
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 5		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8020
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1272
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	6	9	4.10	1060/1522	3.56	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	2	15	4.38	726/1522	3.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	1027/1285	3.68	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	5	7	6	3.62	1275/1476	3.95	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	538/1412	3.62	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	806/1381	4.07	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	0	6	13	4.38	650/1500	3.58	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	487/1517	4.83	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	280/1497	3.55	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	3	15	4.43	904/1440	3.87	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	629/1448	4.27	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	636/1436	3.58	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	820/1432	3.65	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	394/1221	3.56	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	9	8	4.05	701/1280	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	652/1277	3.98	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	509/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	1	2	3	1	6	3.69	612/ 854	3.16	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	5	3	1	7	3	3.00	213/ 215	3.14	3.69	4.36	4.21	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	0	5	4	7	3.63	211/ 228	3.48	4.04	4.35	4.29	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	189/ 217	4.14	4.40	4.51	4.45	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	152/ 216	3.83	4.12	4.42	4.35	4.26	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	3	2	1	4	8	3.67	179/ 205	3.46	3.82	4.23	4.26	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	68/ 77	3.83	4.33	4.52	4.30	3.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	59/ 65	3.67	4.29	4.49	4.33	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8020
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1272
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 333 0101
 Title LAUGHTER AND HUMOR (SS)
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1273
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	10	7	12	3.90	1220/1522	3.90	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	13	11	4.10	1032/1522	4.10	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	7	9	15	15	4.26	766/1285	4.26	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	5	9	11	3.90	1131/1476	3.90	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	316/1412	4.55	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	13	9	3.90	938/1381	3.90	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	10	13	4.13	913/1500	4.13	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	341/1517	4.94	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	10	8	9	3.86	1073/1497	3.86	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	4	12	11	3.94	1232/1440	3.94	4.47	4.45	4.46	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	878/1448	4.74	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	8	10	10	3.93	1127/1436	3.93	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	3	7	16	4.17	949/1432	4.17	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	4	11	13	4.17	524/1221	4.17	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	6	7	10	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	3	4	6	11	3.92	996/1277	3.92	4.34	4.34	4.38	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	3	2	6	12	3.92	943/1269	3.92	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	14	3	2	4	1	1	2.55	830/ 854	2.55	3.86	4.02	4.00	2.55	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	7	Under-grad	31	Non-major	18
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				Other	14						
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 335 0101
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE
 Enrollment: 158
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1274
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	26	0	0	0	9	10	22	4.32	837/1522	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	26	0	0	2	6	16	17	4.17	955/1522	4.17	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	26	0	0	5	8	13	15	3.93	1009/1285	3.93	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	6	3	0	13	8	11	3.69	1233/1476	3.69	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	26	2	2	0	9	12	16	4.03	747/1412	4.03	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	26	3	4	4	10	11	9	3.45	1179/1381	3.45	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	0	2	1	7	31	4.63	349/1500	4.63	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	26	0	0	1	1	4	35	4.78	749/1517	4.78	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	0	0	2	13	15	5	3.66	1210/1497	3.66	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	3	8	28	4.64	630/1440	4.64	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	6	7	26	4.51	1148/1448	4.51	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	3	5	11	20	4.23	896/1436	4.23	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	2	7	11	19	4.21	922/1432	4.21	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	1	0	1	8	9	19	4.24	467/1221	4.24	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	4	1	1	5	4	3.27	****/1280	****	4.08	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	3	0	1	5	5	3.64	****/1277	****	4.34	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	53	0	3	0	1	3	7	3.79	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	53	9	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 3	C 14	General	9
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 67
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BEDI AKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1275
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	5	14	22	4.16	1001/1522	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	4	11	26	4.31	811/1522	4.31	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	9	11	22	4.09	893/1285	4.09	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	3	1	5	5	18	4.06	977/1476	4.06	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	10	31	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	31	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	6	37	4.70	275/1500	4.70	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	21	22	4.41	1152/1517	4.41	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	2	5	12	15	4.18	744/1497	4.18	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	11	29	4.53	763/1440	4.53	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	38	4.78	802/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	5	13	25	4.30	825/1436	4.30	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	9	29	4.36	802/1432	4.36	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	4	1	10	7	8	3.47	921/1221	3.47	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	14	22	4.37	507/1280	4.37	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	7	31	4.68	451/1277	4.68	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	7	32	4.71	430/1269	4.71	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	2	1	6	5	18	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 17		Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	2
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 46
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	32
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1276
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	9	24	4.68	424/1522	4.68	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	16	17	4.47	592/1522	4.47	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	386/1285	4.65	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	14	18	4.47	519/1476	4.47	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	149/1412	4.79	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	14	15	4.34	507/1381	4.34	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	10	23	4.62	374/1500	4.62	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	784/1517	4.76	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	622/1497	4.29	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	552/1440	4.71	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	444/1448	4.91	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	10	24	4.71	373/1436	4.71	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	267/1432	4.82	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	124/1221	4.76	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	560/1277	4.55	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	437/1269	4.70	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	1	2	0	2	9	4.14	391/ 854	4.14	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General	13
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 345 0101
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1277
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4	28	4.66	443/1522	4.66	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.66	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	25	4.49	576/1522	4.49	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	24	4.49	554/1285	4.49	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.49	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	5	6	18	4.29	746/1476	4.29	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	8	21	4.31	511/1412	4.31	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	7	8	15	4.13	733/1381	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	28	4.69	287/1500	4.69	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	146/1517	4.97	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	11	21	4.56	348/1497	4.56	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	30	4.79	372/1440	4.79	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	148/1448	4.97	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	29	4.79	232/1436	4.79	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	29	4.79	305/1432	4.79	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	4	25	4.64	194/1221	4.64	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	8	10	14	4.06	701/1280	4.06	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	299/1277	4.82	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	4	4	25	4.53	570/1269	4.53	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	26	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 2	C 9	General 7	Under-grad 35 Non-major 15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 13	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 3		

Course-Section: PSYC 356 0101
 Title PSYC OF SEX DIFFERENCE
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1278
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	11	3	3.61	1365/1522	3.61	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	9	4	3.57	1339/1522	3.57	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	3	8	7	3.74	1097/1285	3.74	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1374/1476	3.29	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	3	4	5	3	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1381	****	4.09	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	13	4.27	760/1500	4.27	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	8	3	9	4.05	1372/1517	4.05	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	8	7	2	3.29	1361/1497	3.29	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	938/1440	4.39	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	1284/1448	4.30	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	10	8	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	5	9	3.70	1215/1432	3.70	4.30	4.29	4.29	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	1	8	10	4.09	575/1221	4.09	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	1	0	2	5	3.08	1180/1280	3.08	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	2	2	0	5	3.00	1214/1277	3.00	4.34	4.34	4.38	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	6	0	1	2	4	2.85	1235/1269	2.85	4.35	4.31	4.39	2.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C 4	General 6	Under-grad 23	Non-major 7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 2			

Course-Section: PSYC 357 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN
 Instructor: LITOVICH, MARIA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1279
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	559/1522	4.54	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	454/1522	4.58	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	509/1285	4.52	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	519/1476	4.48	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	205/1412	4.70	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	4	12	4.04	784/1381	4.04	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	463/1500	4.52	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	412/1440	4.77	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	602/1448	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	540/1221	4.14	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	134/1269	4.95	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	538/ 854	3.88	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	15	7	13	3.76	1289/1522	4.12	4.27	4.30	4.34	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	7	10	11	8	3.42	1396/1522	3.80	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	10	6	14	3.63	1132/1285	4.08	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	27	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1306/1476	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	6	13	8	3	2.84	1358/1412	3.45	4.09	4.06	4.03	2.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	32	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/1381	4.43	4.09	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	6	24	4.34	690/1500	4.14	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	6	21	8	4.06	1372/1517	4.53	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	3	9	10	5	3.54	1265/1497	3.77	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	8	25	4.57	728/1440	4.58	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	5	27	4.59	1080/1448	4.67	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	5	12	14	4.03	1045/1436	4.14	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	8	19	4.11	991/1432	4.35	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	9	6	13	3.90	695/1221	4.11	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	7	4	4	2	4	2.62	1255/1280	3.57	4.08	4.10	4.14	2.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	9	1	6	2	3	2.48	1268/1277	3.47	4.34	4.34	4.38	2.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	5	5	6	2	3	2.67	1248/1269	3.33	4.35	4.31	4.39	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	16	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	****/ 854	3.00	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	15	General	5	Under-grad	38	Non-major	14
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 360 8020
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1281
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	643/1522	4.12	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	955/1522	3.80	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	509/1285	4.08	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	1009/1476	3.77	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	728/1412	3.45	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	413/1381	4.43	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	3	3	8	3.94	1048/1500	4.14	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1517	4.53	4.75	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	898/1497	3.77	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	705/1440	4.58	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	859/1448	4.67	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	876/1436	4.14	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	548/1432	4.35	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	422/1221	4.11	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	376/1280	3.57	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	623/1277	3.47	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	875/1269	3.33	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 360 8020
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1281
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 370 0101
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 142
 Questionnaires: 82

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1282
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	3	5	11	28	32	4.03	1108/1522	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	4	22	24	28	3.94	1157/1522	3.94	4.20	4.26	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	9	22	24	23	3.75	1092/1285	3.75	4.21	4.30	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	8	6	21	20	13	3.35	1359/1476	3.35	4.14	4.22	4.26	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	11	29	16	17	3.47	1189/1412	3.47	4.09	4.06	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	13	8	16	22	16	3.27	1246/1381	3.27	4.09	4.08	4.13	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	9	18	47	4.48	512/1500	4.48	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	76	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	4	19	27	21	3.84	1089/1497	3.84	4.08	4.11	4.13	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	10	28	35	4.27	1039/1440	4.27	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	9	67	4.84	656/1448	4.84	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	6	17	27	24	3.86	1177/1436	3.86	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	10	23	41	4.34	811/1432	4.34	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	1	4	20	49	4.53	259/1221	4.53	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	6	6	9	11	12	3.39	1088/1280	3.39	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	4	6	16	7	11	3.34	1181/1277	3.34	4.34	4.34	4.38	3.34	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	8	7	9	6	14	3.25	1174/1269	3.25	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	38	34	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	****/ 854	****	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	81	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	81	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	81	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 22	Required for Majors 4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 32	
56-83	19	2.00-2.99	11	C 17	General 5
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	17	D 0	Under-grad 81
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	19	F 0	Non-major 30
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 2
				? 3	Other 61
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1283
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	32	0	0	0	1	12	18	4.55	559/1522	4.65	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	32	0	0	0	2	14	15	4.42	686/1522	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	32	0	0	0	2	14	15	4.42	638/1285	4.27	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	33	14	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	871/1476	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	1	3	11	15	4.33	493/1412	4.20	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	32	18	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	****/1381	4.29	4.09	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	33	0	4	3	2	8	13	3.77	1175/1500	3.70	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	32	0	0	0	0	9	22	4.71	891/1517	4.79	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	198/1497	4.56	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	1	1	9	19	4.53	763/1440	4.70	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	683/1448	4.92	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	1	1	10	18	4.50	601/1436	4.68	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	454/1432	4.57	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	3	0	2	9	7	9	3.85	727/1221	3.96	4.09	3.93	3.94	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	624/1280	4.49	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	796/1277	4.56	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	570/1269	4.76	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	45	11	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/ 854	3.71	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General	3
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 63
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 380 8020
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1284
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	320/1522	4.65	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	874/1522	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	865/1285	4.27	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	722/1412	4.20	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	575/1381	4.29	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	3	6	3.63	1253/1500	3.70	4.17	4.18	4.13	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.79	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	534/1497	4.56	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	256/1440	4.70	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1448	4.92	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	160/1436	4.68	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	682/1432	4.57	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	582/1221	3.96	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	199/1280	4.49	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1277	4.56	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1269	4.76	4.35	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	604/ 854	3.71	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.04	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 380 8020
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1284
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1285
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	26	4.96	71/1522	4.88	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	102/1522	4.84	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	220/1285	4.81	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	207/1476	4.71	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	18	4.42	411/1412	4.41	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	305/1381	4.61	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	139/1500	4.76	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	952/1517	4.76	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	164/1497	4.77	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	77/1440	4.88	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1448	4.98	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	98/1436	4.86	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	187/1432	4.84	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	181/1221	4.78	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	499/1280	4.61	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	321/1269	4.76	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 854	4.58	3.86	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	27
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	8
			P 0		Non-major 4
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	2
					16

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 382 8020
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1286
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	246/1522	4.88	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	244/1522	4.84	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1285	4.81	4.21	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	347/1476	4.71	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	7	15	4.40	430/1412	4.41	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	200/1381	4.61	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	300/1500	4.76	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	532/1517	4.76	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	189/1497	4.77	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	353/1440	4.88	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	247/1448	4.98	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	217/1436	4.86	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	294/1432	4.84	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	69/1221	4.78	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	165/1280	4.61	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	375/1277	4.75	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	430/1269	4.76	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	174/ 854	4.58	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.58	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	****	3.50	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 382 8020
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1286
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	26	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 387 8020
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1287
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	27	4.84	218/1522	4.84	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	171/1522	4.84	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	135/1285	4.92	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	140/1476	4.87	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	133/1412	4.81	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	27	4.77	136/1381	4.77	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	109/1500	4.90	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	20	4.63	973/1517	4.63	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	147/1497	4.80	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	578/1440	4.69	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	179/1436	4.84	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	200/1432	4.88	4.30	4.29	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	5	21	4.64	187/1221	4.64	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	165/1280	4.84	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	28	4.81	308/1277	4.81	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	223/1269	4.91	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	82/ 854	4.84	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.39	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 387 8020
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1287
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	19	Under-grad	33	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 393A 0101
 Title PARENTING
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1288
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	123/1522	4.93	4.27	4.30	4.34	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	186/1522	4.83	4.20	4.26	4.25	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	347/1285	4.69	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	226/1476	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.26	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	6	4	17	4.21	613/1412	4.21	4.09	4.06	4.03	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	233/1381	4.62	4.09	4.08	4.13	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	114/1500	4.90	4.17	4.18	4.13	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	195/1517	4.96	4.75	4.65	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	2	24	4.78	172/1497	4.78	4.08	4.11	4.13	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	77/1440	4.97	4.47	4.45	4.46	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	49/1436	4.96	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.30	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	88/1221	4.86	4.09	3.93	3.94	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	174/1280	4.83	4.08	4.10	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	205/1277	4.91	4.34	4.34	4.38	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	266/1269	4.87	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	145/ 854	4.65	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.65	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: Psyc 399 0130
 Title: Coop. Ed. in PSYC
 Instructor: Rohrbach, Alison
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 6
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	211/1522	****	4.69	4.30	4.14	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1522	****	4.64	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	****	4.72	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1476	****	4.58	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1412	****	4.57	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	413/1381	****	4.28	4.08	3.93	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1500	****	4.45	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	****	4.72	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1497	****	4.43	4.11	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	****	4.95	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	****	4.57	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	****	4.55	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	****	3.94	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	****	4.72	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	****	4.80	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	****	4.82	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	****	4.55	4.02	3.87	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 37	****	4.57	4.63	4.53	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 33	****	4.80	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 22	****	4.50	4.54	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 406 8020
 Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1289
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	809/1285	4.20	4.21	4.30	4.42	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	247/1381	4.60	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	240/1497	4.70	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	4.78	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	380/1221	4.38	4.09	3.93	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.34	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.31	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	3.67	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 406 8020
 Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1289
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 407 0101
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1290
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	1054/1522	4.11	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	864/1522	4.26	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	682/1285	4.37	4.21	4.30	4.42	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	597/1476	4.42	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	557/1412	4.26	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	12	6	4.26	594/1381	4.26	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	770/1500	4.26	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	623/1517	4.84	4.75	4.65	4.71	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	8	4	3.89	1049/1497	3.89	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	774/1440	4.53	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.95	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	814/1436	4.32	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	611/1432	4.53	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	7	5	7	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.09	3.93	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	530/1280	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.28	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.34	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	347/ 854	4.22	3.86	4.02	4.31	4.22
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	2.67	4.41	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12	Graduate	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 437 8020
 Title MAKING A DIFFERENCE
 Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1291
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	5	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	766/1285	4.25	4.21	4.30	4.42	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	4.09	4.06	4.11	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	174/1381	4.71	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1325/1497	3.40	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1023/1440	4.29	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	935/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1177/1436	3.86	4.31	4.29	4.32	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	732/1432	4.43	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	540/1221	4.14	4.09	3.93	4.04	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	672/1277	4.43	4.34	4.34	4.50	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	836/1269	4.14	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.86	4.02	4.31	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	220/ 228	3.00	4.04	4.35	4.32	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	189/ 217	4.00	4.40	4.51	4.55	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	174/ 216	4.00	4.12	4.42	4.20	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	185/ 205	3.50	3.82	4.23	3.85	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.34	4.58	4.67	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	70/ 77	3.50	4.33	4.52	4.60	3.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 65	4.50	4.29	4.49	4.65	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	49/ 78	4.50	4.33	4.45	4.58	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	49/ 80	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.14	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	46/ 47	2.67	2.67	4.41	4.51	2.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	38/ 45	3.67	3.67	4.30	4.22	3.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.03	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	31/ 35	3.33	3.33	4.31	4.13	3.33	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	27/ 34	3.50	3.50	4.30	4.11	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	35/ 37	3.33	3.33	4.63	4.33	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	15/ 23	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.00	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	19/ 22	3.50	3.50	4.54	4.25	3.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	16/ 18	3.50	3.50	4.49	4.25	3.50	

Course-Section: PSYC 437 8020
 Title MAKING A DIFFERENCE
 Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1291
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 440 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL PSYC
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1292
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	656/1522	4.47	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	670/1522	4.43	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.21	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	535/1476	4.47	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	71/1412	4.93	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	305/1381	4.54	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	950/1500	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	602/1497	4.31	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	256/1440	4.87	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	326/1436	4.73	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	214/1432	4.87	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	175/1221	4.67	4.09	3.93	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.08	4.10	4.28	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	351/1277	4.78	4.34	4.34	4.50	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	391/ 854	4.14	3.86	4.02	4.31	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 446 0101
 Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1293
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	478/1285	4.56	4.21	4.30	4.42	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	448/1412	4.39	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	743/1381	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	5	6	3.67	1236/1500	3.67	4.17	4.18	4.25	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.75	4.65	4.71	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	240/1497	4.69	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	630/1440	4.65	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	296/1448	4.94	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	576/1436	4.53	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	267/1432	4.82	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	6	3	1	2.80	1121/1221	2.80	4.09	3.93	4.04	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.08	4.10	4.28	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.34	4.34	4.50	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	400/1269	4.73	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	2	0	2	11	4.47	217/ 854	4.47	3.86	4.02	4.31	4.47	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	56/ 79	4.53	4.34	4.58	4.67	4.53	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	53/ 77	4.60	4.33	4.52	4.60	4.60	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	57/ 65	3.93	4.29	4.49	4.65	3.93	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	61/ 78	4.19	4.33	4.45	4.58	4.19	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	2	0	6	4	4	3.50	62/ 80	3.50	3.97	4.11	4.14	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.33	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101
 Title HISTORY & SYSTEMS OF P
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1294
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	462/1522	4.63	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	670/1522	4.42	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	395/1285	4.63	4.21	4.30	4.42	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	781/1476	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	299/1412	4.58	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	543/1381	4.32	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	600/1500	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	13	4	4.11	1355/1517	4.11	4.75	4.65	4.71	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	859/1497	4.07	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	999/1440	4.32	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	521/1448	4.89	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	865/1436	4.26	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	669/1432	4.47	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1048/1221	3.13	4.09	3.93	4.04	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	237/1280	4.73	4.08	4.10	4.28	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	398/1277	4.73	4.34	4.34	4.50	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	266/1269	4.87	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	555/ 854	3.83	3.86	4.02	4.31	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 493C 0101
 Title HIV & AIDS
 Instructor: HUEBNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1295
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	176/1522	4.91	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	233/1522	4.77	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1285	****	4.21	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	295/1476	4.68	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	115/1412	4.86	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	118/1381	4.81	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	349/1500	4.64	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	487/1517	4.91	4.75	4.65	4.71	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	248/1497	4.68	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	256/1440	4.86	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	247/1448	4.95	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	123/1436	4.91	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	280/1432	4.82	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	144/1221	4.71	4.09	3.93	4.04	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	245/1280	4.72	4.08	4.10	4.28	4.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	245/1277	4.89	4.34	4.34	4.50	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	267/ 854	4.38	3.86	4.02	4.31	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	35/ 79	4.89	4.34	4.58	4.67	4.89	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	39/ 77	4.89	4.33	4.52	4.60	4.89	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	39/ 65	4.67	4.29	4.49	4.65	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	41/ 78	4.67	4.33	4.45	4.58	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	35/ 80	4.44	3.97	4.11	4.14	4.44	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.33	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	3.50	4.30	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	5	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	9	Under-grad
			Electives	0	23
			Other	10	Non-major
					6
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PSYC 493D 0101
 Title PNI
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1296
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	11	4.69	414/1522	4.69	4.27	4.30	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	193/1522	4.81	4.20	4.26	4.34	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1285	****	4.21	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	140/1476	4.88	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	133/1412	4.81	4.09	4.06	4.11	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	280/1381	4.56	4.09	4.08	4.21	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	154/1500	4.81	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	129/1497	4.85	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	134/1440	4.94	4.47	4.45	4.52	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	346/1448	4.94	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	151/1436	4.88	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1432	4.88	4.30	4.29	4.34	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	96/1221	4.81	4.09	3.93	4.04	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1280	4.92	4.08	4.10	4.28	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.34	4.34	4.50	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	75/ 854	4.90	3.86	4.02	4.31	4.90	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101
 Title SEM:VERBAL BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1297
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	211/1522	4.86	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	626/1285	4.43	4.21	4.30	4.31	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	406/1476	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.09	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.09	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1497	4.83	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	716/1440	4.57	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	357/1436	4.71	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	232/1221	4.57	4.09	3.93	3.83	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.34	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601B 0101
 Title CORE II
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1298
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	2	7	0	3.45	1421/1522	3.45	4.27	4.30	4.45	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	1400/1522	3.42	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1268/1285	2.75	4.21	4.30	4.31	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	4	1	3.08	1411/1476	3.08	4.14	4.22	4.31	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	1	3.67	1077/1412	3.67	4.09	4.06	4.25	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	0	1	2.50	1350/1381	2.50	4.09	4.08	4.25	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	6	3	0	0	2.00	1485/1500	2.00	4.17	4.18	4.22	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	1355/1497	3.30	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1393/1448	3.83	4.71	4.71	4.80	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1282/1436	3.50	4.31	4.29	4.37	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1335/1432	3.25	4.30	4.29	4.33	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	695/1221	3.90	4.09	3.93	3.83	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1002/1269	3.80	4.35	4.31	4.51	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	658/ 854	3.57	3.86	4.02	4.08	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 601C 0101
 Title CORE II
 Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT
 Enrollment: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1299
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	2	3.92	1210/1522	3.92	4.27	4.30	4.45	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1037/1522	4.08	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.21	4.30	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1324/1476	3.50	4.14	4.22	4.31	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1013/1412	3.75	4.09	4.06	4.25	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	4	1	1	2.42	1360/1381	2.42	4.09	4.08	4.25	2.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	3	1	1	2.58	1468/1500	2.58	4.17	4.18	4.22	2.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	718/1497	4.20	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	705/1440	4.58	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1232/1448	4.42	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	480/1221	4.22	4.09	3.93	3.83	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	5	1	3.25	1133/1280	3.25	4.08	4.10	4.24	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	908/1277	4.08	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	735/ 854	3.30	3.86	4.02	4.08	3.30

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101
 Title ORG BEHAVIOR MANAGEMEN
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1300
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	3	2	3.45	1421/1522	3.45	4.27	4.30	4.45	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1280/1522	3.73	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	871/1476	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	964/1412	3.82	4.09	4.06	4.25	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1008/1381	3.82	4.09	4.08	4.25	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	940/1500	4.09	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	963/1517	4.64	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1142/1440	4.11	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	995/1436	4.11	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1182/1432	3.78	4.30	4.29	4.33	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	4.09	3.93	3.83	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	855/1277	4.18	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	628/1269	4.45	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.76	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.66	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 0101
 Title INTRO TO BEHAV MEDICIN
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1301
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	702/1522	4.40	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.21	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.80	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	283/1412	4.60	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1381	4.80	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.60	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	931/1440	4.40	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	899/1221	3.50	4.09	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 616 0101
 Title MEAS APPL BEHAV AN
 Instructor: KUHN, DAVID E
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1302
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	176/1522	4.91	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	499/1522	4.55	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.21	4.30	4.31	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	397/1476	4.58	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	420/1412	4.42	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	86/1381	4.91	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	438/1517	4.92	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	622/1497	4.29	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	172/1440	4.92	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1232/1448	4.42	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	124/1221	4.75	4.09	3.93	3.83	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	363/1280	4.55	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	498/1277	4.64	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	321/1269	4.82	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	84/ 854	4.83	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.34	4.58	4.76	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.33	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 65	4.67	4.29	4.49	4.71	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	57/ 78	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.66	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	40/ 80	4.33	3.97	4.11	4.38	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 621 0101
 Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: OJEVWE, PIUS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1303
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1512/1522	2.50	4.27	4.30	4.45	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	1514/1522	2.00	4.20	4.26	4.29	2.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1272/1285	2.50	4.21	4.30	4.31	2.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1467/1476	2.00	4.14	4.22	4.31	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1367/1412	2.75	4.09	4.06	4.25	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1350/1381	2.50	4.09	4.08	4.25	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1498/1500	1.00	4.17	4.18	4.22	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1486/1497	2.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1435/1440	2.00	4.47	4.45	4.48	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1419/1448	3.50	4.71	4.71	4.80	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1432/1436	1.75	4.31	4.29	4.37	1.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1425/1432	1.75	4.30	4.29	4.33	1.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1216/1221	1.00	4.09	3.93	3.83	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1133/1280	3.25	4.08	4.10	4.24	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.34	4.34	4.52	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1242/1269	2.75	4.35	4.31	4.51	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 622 0101
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN I
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1304
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1217/1522	3.86	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1046/1285	3.86	4.21	4.30	4.31	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1416/1476	3.00	4.14	4.22	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	538/1412	4.29	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1381	****	4.09	4.08	4.25	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1391/1500	3.29	4.17	4.18	4.22	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	873/1517	4.71	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	696/1436	4.43	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	732/1432	4.43	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	144/1221	4.71	4.09	3.93	3.83	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	459/1280	4.43	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1277	4.43	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1138/1269	3.43	4.35	4.31	4.51	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 653 0101
 Title CULTURAL HUM DEVEL
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1305
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	11	4.92	158/1522	4.92	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.21	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	91/1412	4.92	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1152/1517	4.42	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	633/1497	4.27	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	578/1221	4.08	4.09	3.93	3.83	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	311/1280	4.63	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.63	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.86	4.02	4.08	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.34	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.29	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.33	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.11	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 686 0101
 Title ETHICAL & PRO ISSUES
 Instructor: BARNETT, JEFF
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1306
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	8	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	602/1285	4.44	4.21	4.30	4.31	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	908/1412	3.89	4.09	4.06	4.25	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	733/1381	4.13	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	809/1500	4.22	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1440	4.89	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	141/1436	4.89	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1021/1221	3.22	4.09	3.93	3.83	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	442/1280	4.44	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	652/1277	4.44	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 695A 0101
 Title: DIVERSITY
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1307
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1365/1522	3.60	4.27	4.30	4.45	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1285	****	4.21	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1476	4.22	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	1296/1412	3.22	4.09	4.06	4.25	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	4	1	3.20	1256/1381	3.20	4.09	4.08	4.25	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1181/1497	3.70	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1440	****	4.47	4.45	4.48	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1320/1432	3.33	4.30	4.29	4.33	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	****	4.09	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	652/1277	4.44	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	72/ 79	3.50	4.34	4.58	4.76	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	4.33	4.52	4.70	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	59/ 65	3.67	4.29	4.49	4.71	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	72/ 78	3.25	4.33	4.45	4.66	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	70/ 80	3.00	3.97	4.11	4.38	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 695B 0101
 Title CHILD HEALTH
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1308
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.27	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	488/1522	4.56	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1285	****	4.21	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	425/1476	4.56	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	393/1412	4.44	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1284/1517	4.22	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1440	****	4.47	4.45	4.48	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1448	****	4.71	4.71	4.80	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1436	****	4.31	4.29	4.37	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1432	****	4.30	4.29	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	4.09	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	657/1280	4.14	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	672/1277	4.43	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	36/ 79	4.88	4.34	4.58	4.76	4.88	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	4.33	4.52	4.70	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	34/ 65	4.75	4.29	4.49	4.71	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	44/ 78	4.63	4.33	4.45	4.66	4.63	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	43/ 80	4.25	3.97	4.11	4.38	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 710 0101
 Title RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1309
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	1	3.54	1390/1522	3.54	4.27	4.30	4.45	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	5	1	3.23	1448/1522	3.23	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1285	****	4.21	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	815/1476	4.23	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	2	2	3.08	1321/1412	3.08	4.09	4.06	4.25	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	556/1381	4.31	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	5	3	3	3.38	1363/1500	3.38	4.17	4.18	4.22	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.85	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	6	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	7	2	2	3.31	1390/1440	3.31	4.47	4.45	4.48	3.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1402/1448	3.75	4.71	4.71	4.80	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	2	4	2	3.33	1334/1436	3.33	4.31	4.29	4.37	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	3	0	2.92	1378/1432	2.92	4.30	4.29	4.33	2.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	4.09	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1013/1280	3.55	4.08	4.10	4.24	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	721/1277	4.36	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	485/1269	4.64	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.86	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 711 0101
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROCED I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1310
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	15	4.94	123/1522	4.94	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	149/1522	4.88	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	220/1285	4.81	4.21	4.30	4.31	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	660/1476	4.38	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	305/1412	4.56	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	470/1381	4.38	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	124/1500	4.88	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	116/1497	4.88	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.47	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	394/1436	4.69	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	113/1432	4.94	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	899/1221	3.50	4.09	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	644/1280	4.17	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	6	1	5	3.92	1004/1277	3.92	4.34	4.34	4.52	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	857/1269	4.08	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.69	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.04	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.40	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.12	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.82	4.23	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	15	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 711L 0101
 Title DATA ANALY. PROCED. II
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1311
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	3	6	4.07	1074/1522	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1142/1285	3.60	4.21	4.30	4.31	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	956/1476	4.10	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.09	4.06	4.25	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.43	4.09	4.08	4.25	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	750/1500	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1215/1497	3.64	4.08	4.11	4.21	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1159/1440	4.08	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1329/1448	4.15	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1181/1436	3.85	4.31	4.29	4.37	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	899/1432	4.23	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1221	4.82	4.09	3.93	3.83	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	420/1269	4.71	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	155/ 215	4.11	3.69	4.36	4.72	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	41/ 228	4.78	4.04	4.35	4.39	4.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 217	4.78	4.40	4.51	4.61	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	189/ 216	3.67	4.12	4.42	4.76	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	4	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	141/ 205	4.00	3.82	4.23	4.40	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 736 0101
 Title APPL PSYC AND PUBLIC P
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1312
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	756/1522	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1168/1522	3.92	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1285	****	4.21	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	735/1476	4.31	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1149/1412	3.54	4.09	4.06	4.25	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1040/1381	3.77	4.09	4.08	4.25	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1223/1500	3.69	4.17	4.18	4.22	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1241/1517	4.31	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	493/1497	4.42	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	751/1440	4.55	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.71	4.71	4.80	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	341/1436	4.73	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	695/1432	4.45	4.30	4.29	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.09	3.93	3.83	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	319/ 854	4.27	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		10
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 741 0101
 Title TOPICS IN BEH MED
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1313
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.27	4.30	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1037/1522	4.08	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.21	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	892/1476	4.17	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1412	****	4.09	4.06	4.25	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	4.09	4.08	4.25	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	731/1497	4.18	4.08	4.11	4.21	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1440	****	4.47	4.45	4.48	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1448	****	4.71	4.71	4.80	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1436	****	4.31	4.29	4.37	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1432	****	4.30	4.29	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.09	3.93	3.83	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	311/1280	4.63	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	508/1277	4.63	4.34	4.34	4.52	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	493/1269	4.63	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	3.86	4.02	4.08	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	54/ 79	4.57	4.34	4.58	4.76	4.57	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	40/ 77	4.83	4.33	4.52	4.70	4.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	43/ 65	4.50	4.29	4.49	4.71	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	37/ 78	4.71	4.33	4.45	4.66	4.71	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	41/ 80	4.29	3.97	4.11	4.38	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

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