

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 191
 Questionnaires: 85

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1367
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 33 | 25 | 3.80 | 1326/1639 | 4.24 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 17 | 41 | 9 | 3.47 | 1493/1639 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.47 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 36 | 10 | 3.38 | 1308/1397 | 3.89 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 3.38 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 23 | 11 | 3.51 | 1406/1583 | 3.80 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 3.51 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 6 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 19 | 34 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 4.13 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 6 | 44 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 3.37 | 1278/1504 | 3.37 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 3.37 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 6 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 19 | 24 | 20 | 3.50 | 1399/1612 | 3.98 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 3.50 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 61 | 12 | 4.08 | 1466/1635 | 4.56 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.08 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 22 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 26 | 19 | 5 | 3.20 | 1440/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 3.20 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 3.61 | 1402/1518 | 4.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 3.61 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 56 | 4.61 | 1101/1520 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.61 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 16 | 30 | 18 | 3.62 | 1304/1517 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 3.62 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 9 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 19 | 21 | 3.45 | 1348/1550 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.45 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 13 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 19 | 22 | 16 | 3.51 | 978/1295 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 3.51 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 47 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 2.39 | 1365/1398 | 3.63 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 2.39 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 46 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 2.51 | 1376/1391 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 2.51 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 45 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 9 | 3.05 | 1313/1388 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 3.05 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 48 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3.15 | ****/ 958 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.71 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 82 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 82 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.33 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 82 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 82 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 82 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 83 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 83 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 83 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 82 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 82 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 82 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 82 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 82 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 191
 Questionnaires: 85

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1367
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 18 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 21 | Required for Majors | 20 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 23 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 9 | General | 9 | Under-grad | 85 | Non-major | 81 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 26 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 178
 Questionnaires: 93

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1368
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 20 | 24 | 4.12 | 1055/1639 | 4.24 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.12 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 35 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 23 | 15 | 3.72 | 1375/1639 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 3.72 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 34 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 3.63 | 1238/1397 | 3.89 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 3.63 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 35 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 9 | 8 | 3.42 | 1440/1583 | 3.80 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 3.42 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 34 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 28 | 4.09 | 714/1532 | 4.13 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.09 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 35 | 40 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 3.39 | ****/1504 | 3.37 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 3.78 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 34 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 19 | 14 | 3.54 | 1383/1612 | 3.98 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 3.54 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 57 | 4.97 | 265/1635 | 4.56 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.97 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 50 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 13 | 8 | 3.65 | 1239/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 3.65 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 37 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 36 | 4.41 | 933/1518 | 4.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.41 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 34 | 4.54 | 1166/1520 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.54 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 37 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 18 | 22 | 4.04 | 1065/1517 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.04 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 28 | 4.18 | 963/1550 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.18 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 11 | 28 | 4.25 | 466/1295 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.25 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 73 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 3.45 | ****/1398 | 3.63 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.85 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 73 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3.45 | ****/1391 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.07 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 73 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 3.70 | ****/1388 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 73 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2.61 | ****/ 958 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.71 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 87 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 87 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 87 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 92 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 178
 Questionnaires: 93

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1368
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 11 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 22 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 29 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 4 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 93 | Non-major | 91 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 18 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 158
 Questionnaires: 147

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1369
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 45 | 4.48 | 642/1639 | 4.24 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.48 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 83 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 33 | 4.34 | 761/1639 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.34 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 83 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 24 | 4.06 | 950/1397 | 3.89 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.06 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 83 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 21 | 4.22 | 832/1583 | 3.80 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.22 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 85 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 20 | 30 | 4.27 | 571/1532 | 4.13 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.27 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 85 | 38 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 14 | 4.13 | ****/1504 | 3.37 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 3.78 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 85 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 20 | 27 | 4.15 | 934/1612 | 3.98 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.15 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 84 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 45 | 4.74 | 913/1635 | 4.56 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.74 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 84 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 38 | 4.60 | 292/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.60 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 45 | 4.74 | 491/1518 | 4.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.74 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 59 | 4.97 | 219/1520 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.97 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 47 | 4.74 | 311/1517 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.74 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 85 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 48 | 4.74 | 376/1550 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.74 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 88 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 27 | 4.13 | 561/1295 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.13 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 106 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 26 | 4.41 | 502/1398 | 3.63 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.41 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 106 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 27 | 4.51 | 608/1391 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.51 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 35 | 4.83 | 307/1388 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.83 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 107 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 4.13 | ****/ 958 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.71 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 140 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 140 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 140 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 142 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 142 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 142 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 142 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 143 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 143 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 143 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 143 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 142 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 158
 Questionnaires: 147

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1369
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|-----|-----------|-----|
| 00-27 | 15 | 0.00-0.99 | 4 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 21 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 26 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 10 | General | 10 | Under-grad | 147 | Non-major | 145 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 15 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FORYS, KELLY
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1370
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 9 | 18 | 4.55 | 561/1639 | 4.24 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.55 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 16 | 4.52 | 506/1639 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.52 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 4.48 | 545/1397 | 3.89 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.48 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 4.04 | 981/1583 | 3.80 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 4.04 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 4.16 | 655/1532 | 4.13 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.16 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | ****/1504 | 3.37 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 3.78 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 23 | 4.72 | 249/1612 | 3.98 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.72 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 4.46 | 1175/1635 | 4.56 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 4.46 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 4.29 | 623/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.29 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 24 | 4.82 | 330/1518 | 4.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.82 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 437/1520 | 4.76 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.93 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 4.75 | 299/1517 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 21 | 4.71 | 401/1550 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.71 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 65/1295 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 4.93 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 4.09 | 742/1398 | 3.63 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 4.09 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.52 | 601/1391 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.52 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 4.65 | 509/1388 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 4.65 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.14 | 418/ 958 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 4.14 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.33 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 3.90 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.01 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 24 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.25 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 26 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.39 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 3.90 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 3.61 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 3.51 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.79 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.60 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.54 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.69 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FORYS, KELLY
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1370
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 2 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 29 | Non-major | 27 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0101
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: BEALL, LISA C
 Enrollment: 97
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1371
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 4.12 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 3.88 | 1274/1639 | 4.05 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.88 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 8 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 19 | 3.88 | 1105/1397 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 3.88 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 7 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 22 | 13 | 3.73 | 1275/1583 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.73 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 8 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 3.79 | 1012/1532 | 4.21 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.79 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 14 | 9 | 3.41 | 1259/1504 | 3.69 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.41 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 23 | 4.14 | 934/1612 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.14 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 45 | 4.92 | 595/1635 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.92 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 20 | 9 | 3.82 | 1117/1579 | 3.75 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.82 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 29 | 4.45 | 891/1518 | 4.55 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.45 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 42 | 4.79 | 819/1520 | 4.58 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.79 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 17 | 25 | 4.29 | 854/1517 | 4.42 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.29 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 16 | 22 | 4.10 | 1029/1550 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.10 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 28 | 4.28 | 443/1295 | 4.31 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.28 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 3.73 | 980/1398 | 3.87 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 3.73 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 31 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 4.15 | 895/1391 | 4.03 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.15 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 31 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.00 | ****/ 958 | 3.96 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.47 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.61 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 3.00 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 55 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | **** | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 2.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.28 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | **** | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | **** | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | **** | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | **** | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 1.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 3.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0101
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: BEALL, LISA C
 Enrollment: 97
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1371
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 17 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 11 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 57 | Non-major | 40 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 26 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 94
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1372
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 31 | 4.30 | 841/1639 | 4.12 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.30 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 13 | 33 | 4.30 | 813/1639 | 4.05 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.30 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 19 | 28 | 4.23 | 813/1397 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.23 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 19 | 4.02 | 995/1583 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.02 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 37 | 4.42 | 419/1532 | 4.21 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.42 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 32 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 3.61 | 1154/1504 | 3.69 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.61 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 17 | 24 | 3.95 | 1109/1612 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.95 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 39 | 4.63 | 1045/1635 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.63 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 29 | 10 | 3.81 | 1133/1579 | 3.75 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.81 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 47 | 4.72 | 529/1518 | 4.55 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.72 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 42 | 4.65 | 1047/1520 | 4.58 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.65 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 39 | 4.55 | 535/1517 | 4.42 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.55 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 31 | 4.17 | 972/1550 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.17 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 40 | 4.37 | 368/1295 | 4.31 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.37 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 3.78 | 950/1398 | 3.87 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 3.78 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 37 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 4.00 | 983/1391 | 4.03 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 35 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 14 | 4.25 | 834/1388 | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 36 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 3.96 | 486/ 958 | 3.96 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 3.96 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 62 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.47 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 60 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 61 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 2.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 61 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 62 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|---|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 16 |
| 28-55 | 10 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 24 |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C | 5 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 |
| | | | | P | 0 |
| | | | | I | 0 |
| | | | | ? | 2 |
| | | | | Required for Majors | 13 |
| | | | | General | 7 |
| | | | | Electives | 4 |
| | | | | Other | 24 |
| | | | | Graduate | 0 |
| | | | | Under-grad | 63 |
| | | | | Major | 16 |
| | | | | Non-major | 47 |
| #### - 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 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 18 | 4.05 | 1103/1639 | 4.12 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.05 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 17 | 3.97 | 1141/1639 | 4.05 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.97 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 17 | 3.90 | 1086/1397 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 3.90 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 4.41 | 597/1583 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.41 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 22 | 4.41 | 441/1532 | 4.21 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.41 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 4.05 | 797/1504 | 3.69 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.05 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 21 | 4.21 | 872/1612 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.21 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 14 | 4.36 | 1273/1635 | 4.63 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.36 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 3.61 | 1270/1579 | 3.75 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.61 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 27 | 4.47 | 849/1518 | 4.55 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.47 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 22 | 4.30 | 1341/1520 | 4.58 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.30 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 25 | 4.42 | 700/1517 | 4.42 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.42 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 20 | 4.24 | 905/1550 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.24 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 19 | 4.28 | 443/1295 | 4.31 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.28 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 15 | 4.10 | 738/1398 | 3.87 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.10 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 3.93 | 1040/1391 | 4.03 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.93 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 22 | 4.45 | 693/1388 | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.57 | ****/ 958 | 3.96 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 39 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.47 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 38 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.28 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | **** | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 40 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | **** | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | A 12 | Required for Majors | 8 |
| 28-55 | 10 | 1.00-1.99 | B 13 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | C 7 | General | 6 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 1 | | Under-grad 41 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 20 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 205 0101
 Title BEFORE WE WERE BORN
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1374
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 22 | 4.76 | 305/1639 | 4.76 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.76 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 4.52 | 496/1639 | 4.52 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.52 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 4.52 | 497/1397 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.52 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 434/1583 | 4.55 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.55 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 4.56 | 299/1532 | 4.56 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.56 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.83 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 4.52 | 469/1612 | 4.52 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.52 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 5 | 4.16 | 1415/1635 | 4.16 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.16 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 4.32 | 590/1579 | 4.32 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.32 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 4.64 | 629/1518 | 4.64 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.64 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 4.56 | 523/1517 | 4.56 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 4.68 | 446/1550 | 4.68 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.68 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 4.68 | 179/1295 | 4.68 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.68 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3.89 | 895/1398 | 3.89 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 3.89 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | 839/1391 | 4.22 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.22 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.56 | 609/1388 | 4.56 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 8 | Required for Majors 4 | Graduate 0 Major 6 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 9 | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 3 | C 4 | General 13 | Under-grad 25 Non-major 19 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 7 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 2 | F 0 | Electives 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 1 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 3 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1375
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 11 | 39 | 4.78 | 281/1639 | 4.39 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.78 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 45 | 4.90 | 128/1639 | 4.65 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.90 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 45 | 4.88 | 175/1397 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.88 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 24 | 4.62 | 363/1583 | 4.44 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.62 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 22 | 4.04 | 744/1532 | 3.85 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.04 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 28 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 4.23 | 638/1504 | 4.23 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.23 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 44 | 4.88 | 123/1612 | 4.79 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.88 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 32 | 4.64 | 1023/1635 | 4.82 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.64 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 4.85 | 125/1579 | 4.54 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.85 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 48 | 4.98 | 64/1518 | 4.89 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.98 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 4.91 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 44 | 4.92 | 141/1517 | 4.73 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.92 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 4.86 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 4.86 | 92/1295 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.86 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 4.81 | 217/1398 | 4.15 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.81 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.47 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 4.86 | 276/1388 | 4.49 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.86 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 29 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4.10 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 28 | Required for Majors 2 | Graduate 0 Major 30 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 14 | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 8 | C 0 | General 3 | Under-grad 51 Non-major 21 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 11 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 | Electives 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 36 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1376
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 9 | 20 | 13 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 4.39 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 23 | 4.41 | 684/1639 | 4.65 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.41 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 25 | 4.43 | 617/1397 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.43 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 25 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 4.26 | 781/1583 | 4.44 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.26 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 3.65 | 1144/1532 | 3.85 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.65 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | ****/1504 | 4.23 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 34 | 4.70 | 270/1612 | 4.79 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.70 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.82 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 13 | 4.23 | 680/1579 | 4.54 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.23 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 35 | 4.79 | 378/1518 | 4.89 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.79 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 37 | 4.81 | 776/1520 | 4.91 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.81 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 27 | 4.53 | 560/1517 | 4.73 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.53 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 33 | 4.71 | 401/1550 | 4.86 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.71 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 28 | 4.35 | 391/1295 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.35 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3.50 | 1106/1398 | 4.15 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 3.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 4.28 | 801/1391 | 4.47 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.28 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 4.12 | 912/1388 | 4.49 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.12 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 26 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 22 | Required for Majors 2 | Graduate 0 Major 22 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 11 | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 5 | C 5 | General 3 | Under-grad 44 Non-major 22 |
| 84-150 | 14 | 3.00-3.49 11 | 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 36 | |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 210H 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1377
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 482/1639 | 4.63 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.63 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 859/1639 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 795/1397 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 402/1583 | 4.57 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.50 | 335/1532 | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.50 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 466/1504 | 4.43 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.43 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 218/1612 | 4.75 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.75 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 706/1635 | 4.88 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.88 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4.14 | 783/1579 | 4.14 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.14 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.88 | 1327/1518 | 3.88 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 3.88 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4.00 | 1077/1550 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.50 | 265/1295 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 496/1388 | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |

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 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 4 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 8 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Major 4 |
| Grad. | 0 | 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 215 0101
 Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C
 Instructor: LEISEY, KIM
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1378
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 21 | 4.19 | 951/1639 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.19 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 21 | 4.53 | 496/1639 | 4.45 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.53 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 25 | 4.50 | 517/1397 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 22 | 4.47 | 512/1583 | 4.41 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.47 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 15 | 4.03 | 751/1532 | 4.04 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.03 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 16 | 4.09 | 780/1504 | 4.14 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.09 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 18 | 4.17 | 903/1612 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.17 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 4.35 | 559/1579 | 4.15 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.35 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 27 | 4.76 | 435/1518 | 4.76 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.76 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 25 | 4.71 | 979/1520 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.71 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 24 | 4.60 | 474/1517 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 22 | 4.60 | 522/1550 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 14 | 3.83 | 791/1295 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.83 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 4.26 | 616/1398 | 4.43 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.26 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 4.91 | 204/1391 | 4.89 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.91 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 4.83 | 307/1388 | 4.77 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.83 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 4.35 | 301/ 958 | 4.46 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.35 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 1 | A 18 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate 0 Major 1 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 12 | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 1 | General 2 | Under-grad 37 Non-major 36 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 12 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives 4 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 26 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 215 0201
 Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C
 Instructor: LEISEY, KIM
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1379
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 4.52 | 593/1639 | 4.36 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.52 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.38 | 709/1639 | 4.45 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.38 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 4.14 | 897/1397 | 4.32 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 4.35 | 669/1583 | 4.41 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.35 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 4.05 | 744/1532 | 4.04 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.05 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 4.19 | 667/1504 | 4.14 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.19 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 3.90 | 1175/1612 | 4.04 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.90 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.81 | 811/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.81 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3.95 | 989/1579 | 4.15 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.95 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.76 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 4.70 | 992/1520 | 4.70 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.70 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.50 | 597/1517 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.35 | 814/1550 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.35 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 4.35 | 383/1295 | 4.09 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.35 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 4.60 | 369/1398 | 4.43 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4.86 | 279/1391 | 4.89 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.86 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 4.71 | 435/1388 | 4.77 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.71 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.57 | 185/ 958 | 4.46 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.57 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.47 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.61 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 25 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | 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 | 16 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: LENNON, NICK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1380
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 3.67 | 1416/1639 | 3.67 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 3.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4.07 | 1044/1639 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.07 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.67 | 1219/1397 | 3.67 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 3.67 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3.67 | 1324/1583 | 3.67 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3.53 | 1223/1532 | 3.53 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.53 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3.33 | 1303/1504 | 3.33 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3.67 | 1327/1612 | 3.67 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3.42 | 1359/1579 | 3.66 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.66 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 4.47 | 863/1518 | 4.45 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.45 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.73 | 925/1520 | 4.55 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.55 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.20 | 947/1517 | 4.14 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3.80 | 1215/1550 | 3.72 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 3.72 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 217/1398 | 4.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 752/1391 | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 201/ 958 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.50 | |

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 5 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 18 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Major 2 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 3 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 4 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1381
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 3.67 | 1416/1639 | 3.67 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 3.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4.07 | 1044/1639 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.07 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.67 | 1219/1397 | 3.67 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 3.67 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3.67 | 1324/1583 | 3.67 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3.53 | 1223/1532 | 3.53 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.53 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3.33 | 1303/1504 | 3.33 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3.67 | 1327/1612 | 3.67 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 3.91 | 1056/1579 | 3.66 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.66 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 4.43 | 919/1518 | 4.45 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.45 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.36 | 1305/1520 | 4.55 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.55 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.07 | 1042/1517 | 4.14 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3.64 | 1281/1550 | 3.72 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 3.72 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 217/1398 | 4.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 752/1391 | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | 201/ 958 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.50 | |

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 5 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 18 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Non-major 16 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 3 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 4 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 230 0201
 Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1382
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 4.62 | 495/1639 | 4.62 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.62 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 4.62 | 404/1639 | 4.62 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.62 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 17 | 4.50 | 517/1397 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 4.43 | 560/1583 | 4.43 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.43 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 4.27 | 571/1532 | 4.27 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.27 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4.19 | 667/1504 | 4.19 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.19 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 19 | 4.72 | 259/1612 | 4.72 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.72 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 6 | 4.24 | 1366/1635 | 4.24 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.24 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 10 | 4.39 | 506/1579 | 4.39 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.39 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 4.85 | 301/1518 | 4.85 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.85 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 4.96 | 219/1520 | 4.96 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.96 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 21 | 4.77 | 287/1517 | 4.77 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.77 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 4.77 | 338/1550 | 4.77 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.77 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 14 | 4.40 | 346/1295 | 4.40 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.40 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 4.43 | 494/1398 | 4.43 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.43 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 4.81 | 332/1391 | 4.81 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.81 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 4.86 | 276/1388 | 4.86 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.86 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 4.25 | 349/ 958 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.25 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 12 | Required for Majors | 8 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 7 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 2 | General | 4 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 0 | | Under-grad 29 |
| 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 | 10 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1383
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 4.10 | 1068/1639 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.10 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 4.14 | 981/1639 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.14 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 4.14 | 897/1397 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/1583 | 3.93 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | **** | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1504 | 3.90 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 4.45 | 575/1612 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.45 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 4.90 | 676/1635 | 4.78 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.90 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 3.52 | 1308/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.52 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 19 | 4.52 | 794/1518 | 4.50 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.52 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 4.55 | 1151/1520 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.55 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 16 | 4.34 | 790/1517 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.34 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 3.90 | 1166/1550 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 3.90 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 4.25 | 459/1295 | 4.36 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.25 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 4.05 | 756/1398 | 3.57 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.05 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 3.90 | 1065/1391 | 3.69 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.90 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 4.55 | 609/1388 | 4.07 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.55 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.67 | 658/ 958 | 3.77 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 3.67 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| ----- | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | A 13 | Required for Majors | 7 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 9 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | C 5 | General | 5 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | D 1 | | Under-grad 29 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 2 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 16 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1384
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 28 | 4.77 | 293/1639 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.77 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 26 | 4.76 | 241/1639 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.76 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 29 | 4.74 | 292/1397 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.74 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 44 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 3.89 | 1171/1583 | 3.93 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.89 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 45 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 18 | 4.09 | 714/1532 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.09 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 14 | 4.09 | 780/1504 | 3.90 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.09 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 27 | 4.68 | 305/1612 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.68 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.78 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 52 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 | 4.65 | 248/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.65 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 31 | 4.83 | 330/1518 | 4.50 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 32 | 4.91 | 491/1520 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.91 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 26 | 4.76 | 299/1517 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.76 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 30 | 4.83 | 265/1550 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.83 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 25 | 4.70 | 167/1295 | 4.36 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.70 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 63 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 3.94 | ****/1398 | 3.57 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 64 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3.73 | ****/1391 | 3.69 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 64 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 3.87 | ****/1388 | 4.07 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 63 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.80 | ****/ 958 | 3.77 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 76 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.47 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 77 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.61 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 76 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 76 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 76 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 3.00 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | **** | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 2.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | **** | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | **** | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 78 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | **** | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1384
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 22 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 8 | C | 0 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 79 | Non-major | 68 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 14 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1385
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 9 | 31 | 4.69 | 391/1639 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.69 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 25 | 4.55 | 476/1639 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.55 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 4.48 | 560/1397 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 4.48 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 20 | 4.59 | 381/1583 | 3.93 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 4.59 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 24 | 4.35 | 488/1532 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.35 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.29 | 576/1504 | 3.90 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 4.29 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 29 | 4.60 | 398/1612 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.60 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 4.93 | 529/1635 | 4.78 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.93 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 19 | 4.45 | 439/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 4.45 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 35 | 4.88 | 257/1518 | 4.50 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.88 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 38 | 4.93 | 437/1520 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.93 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 33 | 4.80 | 239/1517 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.80 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 36 | 4.88 | 208/1550 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.88 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 24 | 4.51 | 260/1295 | 4.36 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.51 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 4.36 | 539/1398 | 3.57 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 4.36 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.29 | 785/1391 | 3.69 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.29 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 19 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.07 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 3.88 | 540/ 958 | 3.77 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 3.88 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.47 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 3.00 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 2.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | **** | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 1.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|------------------------|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 12 | Required for Majors 13 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B 12 | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C 5 | General 2 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D 0 | Under-grad 42 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F 0 | Non-major 27 |
| | | | | P 0 | |
| | | | | I 0 | |
| | | | | ? 1 | Other 12 |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ARNHEIM, DANIEL
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1386
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 14 | 3.73 | 1371/1639 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 3.73 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 20 | 12 | 6 | 3.10 | 1575/1639 | 4.14 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.10 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 7 | 3.17 | 1341/1397 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 3.17 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 3 | 3.31 | 1469/1583 | 3.93 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.31 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 20 | 4.20 | 626/1532 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.20 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 26 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 3.31 | 1323/1504 | 3.90 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.31 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 18 | 11 | 3.58 | 1371/1612 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.58 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 17 | 4.31 | 1311/1635 | 4.78 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.31 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 15 | 1 | 3.09 | 1465/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 3.09 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 18 | 3.76 | 1364/1518 | 4.50 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 3.76 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 27 | 4.27 | 1349/1520 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.27 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 3.55 | 1332/1517 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.55 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 3.16 | 1419/1550 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 3.16 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 24 | 3.96 | 666/1295 | 4.36 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.96 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2.31 | 1375/1398 | 3.57 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 2.31 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 37 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2.88 | 1351/1391 | 3.69 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 2.88 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 37 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.06 | 1312/1388 | 4.07 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 3.06 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 37 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 958 | 3.77 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.47 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.28 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 3.24 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.33 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 19 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 9 | General | 11 | Under-grad | 53 | Non-major | 46 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 2 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 24 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 304 0101
 Title ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 109
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1387
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 21 | 33 | 4.37 | 780/1639 | 4.37 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.37 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 35 | 4.52 | 506/1639 | 4.52 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.52 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 43 | 4.66 | 367/1397 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.66 | | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 10 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 29 | 4.12 | 929/1583 | 4.12 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.12 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 33 | 4.28 | 553/1532 | 4.28 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.28 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 12 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 17 | 19 | 3.56 | 1177/1504 | 3.56 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.56 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 12 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 8 | 27 | 3.83 | 1229/1612 | 3.83 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.83 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 39 | 4 | 3.78 | 1586/1635 | 3.78 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 3.78 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 19 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 21 | 4.14 | 795/1579 | 4.14 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 31 | 4.36 | 1000/1518 | 4.36 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.36 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 53 | 4.86 | 648/1520 | 4.86 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.86 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 41 | 4.59 | 486/1517 | 4.59 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.59 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 40 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 14 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 18 | 3.50 | 978/1295 | 3.50 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 18 | 3.97 | 805/1398 | 3.97 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.97 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 35 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 22 | 4.41 | 694/1391 | 4.41 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.41 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 35 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 31 | 4.70 | 447/1388 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.70 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 35 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3.86 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 30 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 23 |
| 28-55 | 8 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 17 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 11 | 2.00-2.99 | 8 | C | 4 | General | 14 | Under-grad | 72 | Non-major | 49 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 10 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Other | 33 | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 308 8020
 Title CHILD MALTREATMENT
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1388
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 22 | 4.85 | 222/1639 | 4.85 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.85 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 4.81 | 199/1639 | 4.81 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.81 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 517/1397 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 4.72 | 281/1583 | 4.72 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.72 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 4.88 | 113/1532 | 4.88 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.88 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 4.88 | 118/1504 | 4.88 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.88 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4.92 | 90/1612 | 4.92 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.92 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 4.79 | 152/1579 | 4.79 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.79 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 4.73 | 491/1518 | 4.73 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.73 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 4.88 | 597/1520 | 4.88 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 4.73 | 323/1517 | 4.73 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.73 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 21 | 4.77 | 338/1550 | 4.77 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.77 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 4.65 | 191/1295 | 4.65 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.65 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 4.88 | 172/1398 | 4.88 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.88 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 4.88 | 248/1391 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 | 4.92 | 179/1388 | 4.92 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.92 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.70 | 143/ 958 | 4.70 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.70 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 16 | Required for Majors 5 | Graduate 0 | Major 11 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 2 | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | General 7 | Under-grad 27 | Non-major 16 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | 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 8 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1389
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3.88 | 1266/1639 | 3.88 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.88 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3.41 | 1517/1639 | 3.41 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.41 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3.59 | 1252/1397 | 3.59 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.59 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.00 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 4.56 | 299/1532 | 4.56 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.56 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 3.64 | 1129/1504 | 3.64 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.64 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 3.81 | 1245/1612 | 3.81 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.81 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3.13 | 1455/1579 | 3.13 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.13 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 4.41 | 933/1518 | 4.41 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.41 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.35 | 1305/1520 | 4.35 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.35 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3.25 | 1424/1517 | 3.25 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.25 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 3.59 | 1303/1550 | 3.59 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.59 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3.57 | 943/1295 | 3.57 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.57 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 1271/1398 | 3.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.25 | 1281/1391 | 3.25 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | 1185/1388 | 3.50 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 3.50 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 3 | Required for Majors | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 9 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | C 3 | General | 2 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 17 |
| 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 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1390
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 4.16 | 1003/1639 | 4.16 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.16 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 3.72 | 1381/1639 | 3.72 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.72 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 16 | 4.30 | 749/1397 | 4.30 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.30 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 4.06 | 967/1583 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.06 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 3.83 | 965/1532 | 3.83 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.83 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 4.07 | 791/1504 | 4.07 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.07 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 3.28 | 1466/1612 | 3.28 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.28 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 13 | 4.31 | 1303/1635 | 4.31 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.31 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 14 | 4.14 | 783/1579 | 4.14 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 4.06 | 1216/1518 | 4.06 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.06 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 27 | 4.84 | 725/1520 | 4.84 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.84 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 13 | 4.10 | 1030/1517 | 4.10 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.10 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 4.19 | 944/1550 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.19 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 3.67 | 894/1295 | 3.67 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.67 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.43 | 494/1398 | 4.43 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.43 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 4.85 | 279/1391 | 4.85 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.85 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 4.79 | 351/1388 | 4.79 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.79 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.50 | 201/ 958 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.50 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 19 | Required for Majors 1 | Graduate 0 | Major 23 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 10 | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C 1 | General 2 | Under-grad 34 | Non-major 11 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F 0 | Electives 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 25 | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 330 0101
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1391
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 19 | 4.79 | 269/1639 | 4.79 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.79 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 4.38 | 687/1397 | 4.38 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.38 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4.36 | 654/1583 | 4.36 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.36 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 4.04 | 744/1532 | 4.04 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.04 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 4.33 | 544/1504 | 4.33 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.42 | 617/1612 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.42 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 4.42 | 1225/1635 | 4.42 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.42 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 4.40 | 496/1579 | 4.40 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.40 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 4.87 | 271/1518 | 4.87 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.87 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 4.78 | 263/1517 | 4.78 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.78 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 4.87 | 219/1550 | 4.87 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.87 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 4.68 | 173/1295 | 4.68 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.68 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 211/1398 | 4.81 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.81 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.81 | 321/1391 | 4.81 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.81 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 157/1388 | 4.94 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.94 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 7 | Required for Majors | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 8 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | C 2 | General | 4 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 25 |
| 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 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1392
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 6 | 17 | 4.48 | 642/1639 | 4.49 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.48 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 4.46 | 583/1639 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.46 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 18 | 4.50 | 517/1397 | 4.51 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 4.22 | 832/1583 | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.22 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 4.07 | 722/1532 | 3.59 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.07 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 4.27 | 594/1504 | 4.29 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.27 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 4.67 | 317/1612 | 4.51 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.84 | 751/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.84 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 4.06 | 859/1579 | 4.28 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.06 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 4.64 | 629/1518 | 4.77 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.64 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 21 | 4.68 | 1019/1520 | 4.79 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.68 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 17 | 4.54 | 560/1517 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.54 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 4.09 | 586/1295 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.09 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 15 | 4.33 | 560/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.33 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 4.17 | 887/1391 | 4.06 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 11 | 4.13 | 907/1388 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.13 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4.21 | 369/ 958 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.21 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 69/ 224 | 3.64 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.43 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | ****/ 240 | 3.26 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | ****/ 219 | 3.63 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |

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 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | B 6 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | C 8 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 28 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 24 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1393
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 4.67 | 430/1639 | 4.49 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 42 | 4.76 | 252/1639 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.76 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 34 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 42 | 4.69 | 350/1397 | 4.51 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.69 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 34 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 33 | 4.68 | 307/1583 | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.68 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 34 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 22 | 4.02 | 766/1532 | 3.59 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.02 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 34 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 31 | 4.43 | 466/1504 | 4.29 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.43 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 39 | 4.61 | 376/1612 | 4.51 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.61 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 41 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 4.53 | 352/1579 | 4.28 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.53 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 51 | 4.94 | 128/1518 | 4.77 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.94 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 50 | 4.93 | 437/1520 | 4.79 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.93 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 41 | 4.70 | 360/1517 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.70 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 47 | 4.87 | 208/1550 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.87 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 37 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 31 | 4.48 | 289/1295 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.48 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 19 | 4.10 | 735/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.10 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 48 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 24 | 4.28 | 801/1391 | 4.06 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.28 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 49 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 25 | 4.44 | 712/1388 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.44 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 50 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 4.04 | 450/ 958 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.04 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 76 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3.83 | ****/ 224 | 3.64 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 77 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | ****/ 240 | 3.26 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 77 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | ****/ 219 | 3.63 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 78 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.33 | ****/ 215 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 78 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.50 | ****/ 198 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 89
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1393
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 23 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 19 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 12 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 7 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 88 | Non-major | 69 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 15 | D | 2 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 11 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 43 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1394
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 15 | 4.42 | 740/1639 | 4.49 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.42 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 4.46 | 600/1639 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.46 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 4.46 | 589/1397 | 4.51 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.46 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4.36 | 654/1583 | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.36 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2.81 | 1470/1532 | 3.59 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 2.81 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4.11 | 758/1504 | 4.29 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.11 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 17 | 4.42 | 617/1612 | 4.51 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.42 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 4.96 | 331/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.96 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 4.17 | 748/1579 | 4.28 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.34 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.77 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 20 | 4.79 | 819/1520 | 4.79 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.79 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 4.29 | 843/1517 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.29 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 4.33 | 832/1550 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3.61 | 1066/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.61 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3.89 | 1076/1391 | 4.06 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.89 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 3.83 | 1065/1388 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 3.83 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.22 | 364/ 958 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.22 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.08 | 119/ 224 | 3.64 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.08 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 3.50 | 206/ 240 | 3.26 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.50 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 13 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 179/ 219 | 3.63 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 4.45 | 109/ 215 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 4.45 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 61/ 198 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 4.50 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.33 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1394
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 18 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 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 | 17 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1395
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 15 | 4.42 | 740/1639 | 4.49 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.42 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 4.46 | 600/1639 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.46 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 4.46 | 589/1397 | 4.51 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.46 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4.36 | 654/1583 | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.36 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2.81 | 1470/1532 | 3.59 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 2.81 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4.11 | 758/1504 | 4.29 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.11 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 17 | 4.42 | 617/1612 | 4.51 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.42 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 4.96 | 331/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.96 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 382/1579 | 4.28 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.34 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/1518 | 4.77 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/1520 | 4.79 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.79 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/1517 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.29 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/1550 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 20 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1295 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3.61 | 1066/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.61 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3.89 | 1076/1391 | 4.06 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.89 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 3.83 | 1065/1388 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 3.83 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.22 | 364/ 958 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.22 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.08 | 119/ 224 | 3.64 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.08 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 3.50 | 206/ 240 | 3.26 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.50 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 13 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 179/ 219 | 3.63 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 4.45 | 109/ 215 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 4.45 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 61/ 198 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 4.50 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.33 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1395
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 18 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 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 | 17 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 8020
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1396
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 8 | 12 | 4.45 | 684/1639 | 4.49 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.45 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 4.23 | 886/1639 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.23 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 4.45 | 589/1397 | 4.51 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 4.14 | 910/1583 | 4.35 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.14 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 4.24 | 598/1532 | 3.59 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.24 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 4.55 | 336/1504 | 4.29 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.55 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 4.45 | 561/1612 | 4.51 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.45 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 4.76 | 869/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.76 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 4.14 | 783/1579 | 4.28 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.14 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 4.76 | 435/1518 | 4.77 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.76 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 4.76 | 872/1520 | 4.79 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.76 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 4.29 | 854/1517 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.29 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.57 | 556/1550 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 4.37 | 539/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.37 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.11 | 936/1391 | 4.06 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.11 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 4.16 | 892/1388 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.16 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3.44 | 751/ 958 | 4.03 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.44 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 3 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1.95 | 223/ 224 | 3.64 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 1.95 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2.79 | 228/ 240 | 3.26 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 2.79 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2.88 | 217/ 219 | 3.63 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 2.88 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2.95 | 208/ 215 | 3.95 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 2.95 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2.94 | 194/ 198 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 2.94 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 19 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 20 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 19 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 19 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 331 8020
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1396
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 11 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 19 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 20 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1397
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 3.26 | 1563/1639 | 3.78 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.26 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 18 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 3.30 | 1542/1639 | 3.77 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.30 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 17 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 3.58 | 1252/1397 | 3.97 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.58 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 18 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 3.82 | 1219/1583 | 4.09 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.82 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 3.22 | 1374/1532 | 3.44 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.22 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 3.26 | 1337/1504 | 3.97 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.26 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 18 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 3.70 | 1310/1612 | 4.02 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.70 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 4.87 | 721/1635 | 4.93 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 23 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 3.00 | 1477/1579 | 3.34 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 19 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 3.77 | 1361/1518 | 4.24 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 3.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 18 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 3.57 | 1487/1520 | 4.11 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.57 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 18 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3.39 | 1387/1517 | 3.61 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.39 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 3.39 | 1370/1550 | 3.72 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.39 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 19 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 3.17 | 1132/1295 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2.93 | 1300/1398 | 3.45 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 2.93 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 26 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3.13 | 1302/1391 | 3.80 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.13 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 27 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2.79 | 1352/1388 | 3.75 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 2.79 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 27 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.70 | ****/ 958 | 3.26 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | 4.44 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | 4.33 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 219 | 4.78 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | 4.56 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | 4.33 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** |

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 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 8 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | C 4 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 41 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 18 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: FINGER, MARIA Y
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1398
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 3.78 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 22 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 3.55 | 1462/1639 | 3.77 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 22 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 13 | 3.76 | 1175/1397 | 3.97 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.76 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 22 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.09 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 23 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 3.41 | 1300/1532 | 3.44 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.41 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 4.29 | 585/1504 | 3.97 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 23 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 3.82 | 1237/1612 | 4.02 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.82 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 529/1635 | 4.93 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 27 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 3.08 | 1465/1579 | 3.34 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.08 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 24 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 4.19 | 1148/1518 | 4.24 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 23 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 4.32 | 1325/1520 | 4.11 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.32 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 24 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 3.22 | 1429/1517 | 3.61 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.22 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 3.59 | 1300/1550 | 3.72 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.59 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 24 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3.30 | 1081/1295 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.30 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 3.62 | 1066/1398 | 3.45 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.62 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 30 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 3.95 | 1024/1391 | 3.80 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.95 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 31 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 3.75 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 31 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.77 | 603/ 958 | 3.26 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.77 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 46 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.20 | ****/ 224 | 4.44 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/ 240 | 4.33 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | ****/ 219 | 4.78 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | ****/ 215 | 4.56 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 46 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | 4.33 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 20 | Required for Majors 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 7 | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 12 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C 0 | Under-grad 51 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D 0 | Non-major 32 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F 0 | |
| | | | | P 0 | |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

| | | | |
|---|---|-------|----|
| I | 0 | Other | 25 |
| ? | 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: STO DOMINGO, MA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1399
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4.08 | 1089/1639 | 3.78 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.08 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 4.46 | 583/1639 | 3.77 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.46 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 18 | 4.58 | 447/1397 | 3.97 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.58 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 4.44 | 548/1583 | 4.09 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.44 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 3.70 | 1104/1532 | 3.44 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.70 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 16 | 4.36 | 529/1504 | 3.97 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.36 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 4.54 | 459/1612 | 4.02 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.54 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.93 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 3.95 | 972/1579 | 3.34 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.95 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.24 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 4.43 | 1256/1520 | 4.11 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.43 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 4.21 | 928/1517 | 3.61 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.21 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 16 | 4.18 | 963/1550 | 3.72 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 3.80 | 929/1398 | 3.45 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 4.30 | 778/1391 | 3.80 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.30 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.45 | 702/1388 | 3.75 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2.75 | 895/ 958 | 3.26 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 2.75 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 64/ 224 | 4.44 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.44 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 115/ 240 | 4.33 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 60/ 219 | 4.78 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.78 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 89/ 215 | 4.56 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 4.56 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.33 | 86/ 198 | 4.33 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 4.33 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 28 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 28 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: STO DOMINGO, MA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1399
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 31 | Non-major | 17 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 20 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 335 0101
 Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 125
 Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1400
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 22 | 36 | 4.15 | 1016/1639 | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.15 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 28 | 23 | 3.78 | 1338/1639 | 4.26 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.78 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 23 | 24 | 3.82 | 1144/1397 | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.82 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 21 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 13 | 15 | 3.41 | 1444/1583 | 4.04 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.41 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 20 | 30 | 3.93 | 883/1532 | 4.34 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.93 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 2 | 18 | 10 | 18 | 10 | 15 | 2.92 | 1433/1504 | 3.67 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 2.92 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 49 | 4.59 | 398/1612 | 4.65 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.59 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 68 | 4.96 | 331/1635 | 4.98 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.96 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 27 | 20 | 3.85 | 1102/1579 | 4.15 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.85 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 24 | 33 | 4.15 | 1169/1518 | 4.58 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.15 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 56 | 4.64 | 1074/1520 | 4.71 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.64 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 31 | 20 | 3.82 | 1235/1517 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.82 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 19 | 39 | 4.25 | 897/1550 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 22 | 14 | 3.53 | 963/1295 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.53 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 3.30 | 1192/1398 | 3.60 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.30 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 35 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 18 | 3.80 | 1124/1391 | 3.95 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.80 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 35 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 3.34 | 1245/1388 | 3.76 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 3.34 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 35 | 33 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.25 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 26 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 48 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 26 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 13 | 2.00-2.99 | 14 | C | 15 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 76 | Non-major | 28 |
| 84-150 | 18 | 3.00-3.49 | 21 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 63 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 335 8020
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1401
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 342/1639 | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.73 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 273/1639 | 4.26 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.73 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 4.56 | 457/1397 | 4.19 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 323/1583 | 4.04 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 178/1532 | 4.34 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4.43 | 466/1504 | 3.67 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.43 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 4.71 | 259/1612 | 4.65 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.71 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.98 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 427/1579 | 4.15 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.46 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 4.58 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 837/1520 | 4.71 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.79 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 287/1517 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.77 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 401/1550 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.71 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.57 | 234/1295 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.57 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3.91 | 887/1398 | 3.60 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.91 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.09 | 940/1391 | 3.95 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.09 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.18 | 877/1388 | 3.76 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.18 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

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 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 3 | General | 3 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 1 | | Under-grad 25 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 8 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1402
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 21 | 4.37 | 780/1639 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.37 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 4.06 | 1052/1639 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.06 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 3.83 | 1138/1397 | 3.74 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.83 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.00 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 25 | 4.53 | 323/1532 | 4.37 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.53 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/1504 | 3.67 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 21 | 4.60 | 388/1612 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.60 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 15 | 4.38 | 1250/1635 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.38 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 3.71 | 1200/1579 | 3.76 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.71 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 23 | 4.37 | 978/1518 | 4.47 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.37 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 4.89 | 597/1520 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.89 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 19 | 4.34 | 790/1517 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.34 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 21 | 4.20 | 944/1550 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.20 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 4.09 | 586/1295 | 3.97 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.09 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 4.16 | 695/1398 | 4.19 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.16 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 4.40 | 694/1391 | 4.38 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.40 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 3.64 | 670/ 958 | 3.92 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.64 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 8 | Required for Majors | 3 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 14 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 8 | General | 4 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 8 | D 0 | | Under-grad 38 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 7 | F 0 | Electives | 2 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 22 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 340 8020
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ARTEAGA, SHIRLE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1403
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.29 | 860/1639 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.29 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4.29 | 831/1639 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.29 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.64 | 1228/1397 | 3.74 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.64 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.00 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.21 | 616/1532 | 4.37 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.21 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3.67 | 1116/1504 | 3.67 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.21 | 860/1612 | 4.41 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.21 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.80 | 1133/1579 | 3.76 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.80 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.57 | 720/1518 | 4.47 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4.50 | 1188/1520 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.36 | 779/1517 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.36 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 4.21 | 927/1550 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.21 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 3.86 | 768/1295 | 3.97 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.86 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.21 | 660/1398 | 4.19 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.21 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4.36 | 736/1391 | 4.38 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.36 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.64 | 521/1388 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.64 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 380/ 958 | 3.92 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.20 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 83
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1404
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 4.41 | 754/1639 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.41 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.48 | 550/1639 | 4.42 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.48 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 4.48 | 545/1397 | 4.24 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.48 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 4.41 | 597/1583 | 4.03 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.41 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 4.67 | 236/1532 | 4.56 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.67 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 4.38 | 506/1504 | 4.17 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.38 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 4.37 | 669/1612 | 3.88 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.37 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 4.81 | 796/1635 | 4.47 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.81 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 14 | 4.48 | 404/1579 | 4.50 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.48 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 4.52 | 794/1518 | 4.61 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.52 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 4.89 | 597/1520 | 4.90 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.89 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 18 | 4.59 | 486/1517 | 4.68 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.59 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 19 | 4.52 | 626/1550 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.52 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 4.60 | 221/1295 | 4.37 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.60 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 4.45 | 477/1398 | 4.58 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.45 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 4.90 | 227/1391 | 4.78 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.90 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 134/1388 | 4.93 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.95 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4.25 | 349/ 958 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.25 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 9 | Required for Majors 2 | Graduate 0 Major 24 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 14 | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 5 | C 1 | General 4 | Under-grad 28 Non-major 4 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 5 | 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 15 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 342 8020
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1405
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 19 | 4.72 | 366/1639 | 4.56 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.72 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 4.36 | 735/1639 | 4.42 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.36 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.24 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 3.65 | 1331/1583 | 4.03 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.65 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 14 | 4.46 | 388/1532 | 4.56 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.46 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 3.96 | 884/1504 | 4.17 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.96 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 3.38 | 1445/1612 | 3.88 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.38 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4 | 4.13 | 1441/1635 | 4.47 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.13 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 4.52 | 362/1579 | 4.50 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.52 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 4.70 | 561/1518 | 4.61 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.70 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 4.91 | 491/1520 | 4.90 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.91 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 4.77 | 275/1517 | 4.68 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.77 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 4.59 | 533/1550 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.59 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.14 | 545/1295 | 4.37 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.14 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 4.71 | 294/1398 | 4.58 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.78 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 4.90 | 224/1388 | 4.93 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.90 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.00 | 456/ 958 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 342 8020
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1405
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 8 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 14 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 11 | Under-grad | 25 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | 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 | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 345 0101
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1406
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 4.37 | 780/1639 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.37 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 4.44 | 617/1639 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.44 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 4.04 | 961/1397 | 4.09 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.04 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | ****/1583 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | **** | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 4.33 | 506/1532 | 4.17 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.33 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 4.41 | 632/1612 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.41 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 4.62 | 1056/1635 | 4.81 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.62 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 7 | 4.04 | 865/1579 | 3.90 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.04 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.63 | 656/1518 | 4.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.63 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 4.89 | 597/1520 | 4.86 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.89 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 4.44 | 674/1517 | 4.56 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.44 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 19 | 4.63 | 500/1550 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.63 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 3.96 | 677/1295 | 3.96 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.96 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 4.27 | 608/1398 | 4.56 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.27 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 16 | 4.64 | 516/1391 | 4.60 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.64 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.55 | 616/1388 | 4.56 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.55 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/ 958 | 3.83 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 4 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 17 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 5 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 28 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | 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 | 15 | | | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 345 8020
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH
 Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1407
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 540/1639 | 4.47 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 831/1639 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.29 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 897/1397 | 4.09 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 597/1583 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.40 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 4.17 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 779/1612 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.29 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.81 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.75 | 1170/1579 | 3.90 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.75 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 1162/1518 | 4.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.17 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 725/1520 | 4.86 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 405/1517 | 4.56 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.33 | 832/1550 | 4.48 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1295 | 3.96 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 189/1398 | 4.56 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.86 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 564/1391 | 4.60 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.57 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 593/1388 | 4.56 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.57 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3.83 | 563/ 958 | 3.83 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.83 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 357 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1408
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 16 | 4.25 | 890/1639 | 4.25 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 4.16 | 959/1639 | 4.16 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.16 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 14 | 4.22 | 831/1397 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.22 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 4.19 | 852/1583 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.19 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 17 | 4.45 | 388/1532 | 4.45 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.45 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 3.96 | 884/1504 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.96 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 4.20 | 882/1612 | 4.20 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.20 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 4.65 | 1023/1635 | 4.65 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.65 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 4 | 3.71 | 1200/1579 | 3.71 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.71 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 21 | 4.57 | 733/1518 | 4.57 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 4.80 | 802/1520 | 4.80 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 4.55 | 535/1517 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.55 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 14 | 4.24 | 905/1550 | 4.24 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.24 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 4.22 | 481/1295 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.22 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 4.50 | 426/1398 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.80 | 332/1391 | 4.80 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.75 | 387/1388 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3.53 | 712/ 958 | 3.53 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.53 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 16 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 Major 15 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 9 | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 1 | General 8 | Under-grad 33 Non-major 18 |
| 84-150 | 11 | 3.00-3.49 8 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 0 | Electives 4 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 11 | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 360 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1409
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 3.55 | 1475/1639 | 3.55 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.55 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 3.52 | 1477/1639 | 3.52 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.52 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 3.54 | 1262/1397 | 3.54 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.54 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 2.77 | 1475/1532 | 2.77 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 2.77 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 4.07 | 996/1612 | 4.07 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.07 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 4.00 | 1497/1635 | 4.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 1 | 3.17 | 1445/1579 | 3.17 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.17 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 4.54 | 770/1518 | 4.54 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.54 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 19 | 4.62 | 1087/1520 | 4.62 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.62 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 3.71 | 1276/1517 | 3.71 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.71 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 3.79 | 1223/1550 | 3.79 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.79 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 3.48 | 989/1295 | 3.48 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.48 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.46 | 1359/1398 | 2.46 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 2.46 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1.85 | 1391/1391 | 1.85 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 1.85 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2.23 | 1379/1388 | 2.23 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 2.23 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 4 | Required for Majors 2 | Graduate 0 | Major 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 6 | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C 12 | General 1 | Under-grad 32 | Non-major 25 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 1 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F 0 | Electives 3 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | |
| | | | | P 0 | | | |
| | | | | I 0 | Other 19 | | |
| | | | | ? 1 | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 370 0101
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 121
 Questionnaires: 114

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1410
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 46 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 17 | 31 | 4.04 | 1110/1639 | 4.04 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.04 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 46 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 14 | 20 | 21 | 3.71 | 1388/1639 | 3.71 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.71 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 46 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 24 | 21 | 3.79 | 1155/1397 | 3.79 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.79 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 46 | 17 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 3.49 | 1410/1583 | 3.49 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.49 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 47 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 19 | 23 | 17 | 3.71 | 1092/1532 | 3.71 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 47 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 17 | 14 | 11 | 3.11 | 1388/1504 | 3.11 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 47 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 16 | 45 | 4.52 | 469/1612 | 4.52 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.52 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 66 | 4.99 | 133/1635 | 4.99 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.99 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 50 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 23 | 14 | 3.66 | 1239/1579 | 3.66 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.66 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 46 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 27 | 24 | 3.97 | 1261/1518 | 3.97 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 3.97 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 46 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 53 | 4.71 | 979/1520 | 4.71 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 46 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 21 | 22 | 15 | 3.53 | 1339/1517 | 3.53 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.53 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 47 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 24 | 30 | 4.16 | 972/1550 | 4.16 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.16 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 46 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 16 | 35 | 4.19 | 505/1295 | 4.19 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.19 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 67 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 12 | 3.28 | 1201/1398 | 3.28 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.28 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 67 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 14 | 3.57 | 1200/1391 | 3.57 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.57 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 68 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 10 | 14 | 3.59 | 1162/1388 | 3.59 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 3.59 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 66 | 36 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.08 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 22 | Required for Majors 3 | Graduate 0 Major 44 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 21 | | |
| 56-83 | 14 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 16 | General 7 | Under-grad 114 Non-major 70 |
| 84-150 | 15 | 3.00-3.49 16 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 14 | F 0 | Electives 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 50 | |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1411
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 20 | 4.41 | 754/1639 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.41 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 20 | 4.61 | 404/1639 | 4.61 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.61 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 4.72 | 323/1397 | 4.72 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.72 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 36 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 4.46 | 524/1583 | 4.46 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.46 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 35 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 4.17 | 648/1532 | 4.17 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.17 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 35 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 4.24 | 620/1504 | 4.24 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.24 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 28 | 4.78 | 186/1612 | 4.78 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.78 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 28 | 4.90 | 662/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.90 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 40 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 18 | 4.68 | 234/1579 | 4.68 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.68 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 27 | 4.87 | 271/1518 | 4.87 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.87 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 4.97 | 219/1520 | 4.97 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.97 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 24 | 4.77 | 287/1517 | 4.77 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.77 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 36 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 4.90 | 185/1550 | 4.90 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.90 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 36 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 4.13 | 561/1295 | 4.13 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.13 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 53 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.15 | ****/1398 | **** | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 53 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 53 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.23 | ****/1388 | **** | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 53 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3.67 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 19 | Required for Majors | 1 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 3 | | Graduate |
| 56-83 | 9 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 6 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad |
| 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 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1412
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 4.80 | 257/1639 | 4.80 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 21 | 4.67 | 349/1639 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 4.73 | 302/1397 | 4.73 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.73 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 23 | 4.76 | 239/1583 | 4.76 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.76 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 4.33 | 506/1532 | 4.33 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.33 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 17 | 4.47 | 416/1504 | 4.47 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.47 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 4.80 | 166/1612 | 4.80 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.80 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 4.53 | 1114/1635 | 4.53 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.53 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 4.65 | 248/1579 | 4.65 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.65 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 4.93 | 149/1518 | 4.93 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.93 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 4.97 | 63/1517 | 4.97 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.97 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 4.97 | 70/1550 | 4.97 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.97 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 21 | 4.67 | 185/1295 | 4.67 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.67 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 369/1398 | 4.60 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.60 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 4.70 | 462/1391 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.70 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 4.84 | 286/1388 | 4.84 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.84 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 12 | Required for Majors | 1 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | B 12 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | C 2 | General | 6 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 31 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 1 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 22 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0201
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1413
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 7 | 30 | 4.72 | 366/1639 | 4.72 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.72 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 28 | 4.67 | 349/1639 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 28 | 4.72 | 323/1397 | 4.72 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.72 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 17 | 4.03 | 995/1583 | 4.03 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.03 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 24 | 4.31 | 535/1532 | 4.31 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.31 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 3.95 | 896/1504 | 3.95 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.95 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 24 | 4.26 | 814/1612 | 4.26 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.26 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 16 | 4.41 | 1225/1635 | 4.41 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.41 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 29 | 4.74 | 190/1579 | 4.74 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.74 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 27 | 4.64 | 629/1518 | 4.64 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.64 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 36 | 4.92 | 437/1520 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.92 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 31 | 4.77 | 287/1517 | 4.77 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.77 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 34 | 4.87 | 208/1550 | 4.87 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.87 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 3.81 | 806/1295 | 3.81 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.81 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 19 | 4.54 | 408/1398 | 4.54 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.54 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 22 | 4.71 | 441/1391 | 4.71 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.71 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 4.89 | 234/1388 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.89 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.22 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 18 | Required for Majors | 3 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | B 7 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 2 | General | 8 |
| 84-150 | 16 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 40 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 2 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 16 |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 390 0101
 Title NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1414
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 4.05 | 1110/1639 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.05 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 3.45 | 1501/1639 | 3.45 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.45 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 3.27 | 1330/1397 | 3.27 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.27 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1583 | **** | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | **** | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3.50 | 1241/1532 | 3.50 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.50 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1504 | **** | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | **** | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 4.50 | 490/1612 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.50 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 3.73 | 1592/1635 | 3.73 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 3.73 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 3.41 | 1359/1579 | 3.41 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.41 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 16 | 4.68 | 575/1518 | 4.68 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.68 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.55 | 1158/1520 | 4.55 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.55 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 3.95 | 1132/1517 | 3.95 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.95 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 4.14 | 1000/1550 | 4.14 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.14 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 3.62 | 923/1295 | 3.62 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.62 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2.60 | 1349/1398 | 2.60 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 2.60 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3.40 | 1247/1391 | 3.40 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.40 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3.10 | 1307/1388 | 3.10 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 3.10 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: PSYC 390 0101
 Title NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1414
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 3 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 26 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 11 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 393X 8020
 Title HUMAN SEXUALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1415
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 171/1639 | 4.91 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.91 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 735/1639 | 4.36 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.36 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 795/1397 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | 771/1583 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.27 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4.27 | 562/1532 | 4.27 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.27 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.27 | 594/1504 | 4.27 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.27 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3.20 | 1488/1612 | 3.20 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.20 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4.36 | 1265/1635 | 4.36 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.36 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 4.18 | 737/1579 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.18 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.18 | 1148/1518 | 4.18 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.18 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 776/1520 | 4.82 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.82 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 661/1517 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4.45 | 703/1550 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.45 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.20 | 505/1295 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.20 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 426/1398 | 4.50 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 462/1391 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.70 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 459/1388 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.70 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.50 | 201/ 958 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.50 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 399 0130
 Title Coop Educ in Psych
 Instructor: Rohrbach, Alison
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 22
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 318/1639 | **** | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.08 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | **** | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 182/1397 | **** | 4.51 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.88 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1583 | **** | 4.31 | 4.19 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 178/1532 | **** | 4.07 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 4.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 182/1504 | **** | 4.14 | 4.05 | 3.78 | 4.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 128/1612 | **** | 4.13 | 4.16 | 4.10 | 4.88 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | **** | 4.78 | 4.65 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 312/1579 | **** | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.95 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 286/1518 | **** | 4.46 | 4.43 | 4.38 | 4.86 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 674/1520 | **** | 4.76 | 4.70 | 4.61 | 4.86 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 198/1517 | **** | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 4.86 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 401/1550 | **** | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.17 | 4.71 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1295 | **** | 4.31 | 3.94 | 3.84 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | **** | 4.37 | 4.07 | 3.85 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | **** | 4.60 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | **** | 4.53 | 4.28 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 119/ 958 | **** | 4.39 | 3.93 | 3.71 | 4.75 | |

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 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | B 0 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 5 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 12 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 2 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 406 0101
 Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1416
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 4.48 | 656/1639 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.48 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 4.43 | 633/1639 | 4.43 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.43 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.52 | 497/1397 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.52 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 4.05 | 974/1583 | 4.05 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.05 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 14 | 4.61 | 276/1532 | 4.61 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.61 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 3.81 | 1010/1504 | 3.81 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.81 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 4.70 | 281/1612 | 4.70 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.70 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 4.26 | 1342/1635 | 4.26 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.26 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 4.18 | 737/1579 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.18 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 4.57 | 733/1518 | 4.57 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 4.74 | 925/1520 | 4.74 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.74 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 4.61 | 474/1517 | 4.61 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.61 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 4.78 | 313/1550 | 4.78 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.78 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 4.57 | 234/1295 | 4.57 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.57 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 4.31 | 574/1398 | 4.31 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.31 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 258/1391 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 317/1388 | 4.81 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.81 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 8 | Required for Majors | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 7 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 2 | General | 1 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 26 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 18 |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 407 8020
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1417
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 137/1639 | 4.93 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.93 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 114/1583 | 4.92 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.92 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 84/1532 | 4.93 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.93 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 89/1504 | 4.93 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.93 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 90/1612 | 4.93 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.93 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4.50 | 382/1579 | 4.50 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.50 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 170/1518 | 4.93 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.93 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.18 | 513/1295 | 4.18 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.18 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 4.83 | 200/1398 | 4.83 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 192/ 958 | 4.55 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 4.55 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | 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 | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1418
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 3.73 | 1371/1639 | 3.73 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.73 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3.60 | 1444/1639 | 3.60 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.60 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4.13 | 906/1397 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.13 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3.73 | 1275/1583 | 3.73 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.73 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3.60 | 1184/1532 | 3.60 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 3.60 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.67 | 1116/1504 | 3.67 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3.33 | 1455/1612 | 3.33 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.33 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67 | 1001/1635 | 4.67 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.67 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3.08 | 1465/1579 | 3.08 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.08 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3.93 | 1293/1518 | 3.93 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 3.93 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.57 | 1136/1520 | 4.57 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.57 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3.73 | 1268/1517 | 3.73 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.73 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 3.60 | 1297/1550 | 3.60 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.60 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2.85 | 1207/1295 | 2.85 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 2.85 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.70 | 1002/1398 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 3.70 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.70 | 1168/1391 | 3.70 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 3.70 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.10 | 1307/1388 | 3.10 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 3.10 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.50 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 437 0101
 Title MAKING A DIFFERENCE
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1419
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 4.22 | 919/1639 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.22 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.33 | 774/1639 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 151/1583 | 4.89 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.89 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 262/1532 | 4.63 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.63 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 245/1504 | 4.67 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | 965/1612 | 4.11 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.11 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 884/1635 | 4.75 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.75 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 269/1579 | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.63 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 745/1518 | 4.56 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 405/1517 | 4.67 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 325/1550 | 4.78 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.78 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 459/1295 | 4.25 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.25 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 4.56 | 397/1398 | 4.56 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 248/1391 | 4.89 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.89 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.57 | 694/ 958 | 3.57 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 3.57 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.83 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.56 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.02 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | **** | 4.04 | 4.84 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | **** | 4.05 | 4.58 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | **** | 4.75 | 4.71 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | **** | 4.58 | 4.73 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.56 | 4.64 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | **** | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.51 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | **** | 4.69 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | **** | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | **** | 4.52 | 4.50 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PSYC 446 8020
 Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1420
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 7 | 4.50 | 615/1639 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 199/1639 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 299/1583 | 4.70 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.70 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 216/1532 | 4.70 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.70 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 222/1504 | 4.70 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.70 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 220/1579 | 4.70 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.70 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 157/1517 | 4.90 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.90 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 174/1550 | 4.90 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.90 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 82/1295 | 4.90 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.90 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 161/1398 | 4.90 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.90 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 227/1391 | 4.90 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.90 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 119/ 958 | 4.75 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 4.75 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.83 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.56 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.02 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101
 Title SOCIAL/HEALTH
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1421
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 4.44 | 712/1639 | 4.44 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.44 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4.06 | 1044/1639 | 4.06 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.06 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4.75 | 239/1583 | 4.75 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.75 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 4.69 | 223/1532 | 4.69 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.69 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 4.69 | 230/1504 | 4.69 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.69 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.53 | 1387/1612 | 3.53 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.53 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 3.50 | 1603/1635 | 3.50 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 3.50 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.21 | 702/1579 | 4.21 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.21 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.25 | 1094/1518 | 4.25 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 622/1520 | 4.88 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.31 | 822/1517 | 4.31 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.31 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 4.69 | 435/1550 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.69 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 277/1398 | 4.73 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.73 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 265/1388 | 4.87 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.87 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 4.36 | 296/ 958 | 4.36 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 4.36 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 10 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | 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 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 493B 0101
 Title HIV/AIDS
 Instructor: HUEBNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1422
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 10 | 4.91 | 171/1639 | 4.91 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.91 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 191/1639 | 4.82 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.82 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 186/1583 | 4.80 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.80 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1532 | 5.00 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 146/1504 | 4.82 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.82 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 160/1612 | 4.82 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.82 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 662/1635 | 4.90 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.90 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1579 | 5.00 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 5.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 157/1517 | 4.90 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.90 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 174/1550 | 4.91 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.91 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 203/1295 | 4.64 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.64 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 161/1398 | 4.90 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.90 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 267/ 958 | 4.40 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 4.40 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 5 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 3 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 5 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 11 |
| Grad. | 0 | 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 493C 0101
 Title ADDICTIONS
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1423
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 9 | 4.82 | 248/1639 | 4.82 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.82 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 476/1639 | 4.55 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.55 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 589/1397 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 434/1583 | 4.55 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.55 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 256/1532 | 4.64 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.64 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 429/1504 | 4.45 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.45 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.36 | 681/1612 | 4.36 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.36 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 662/1635 | 4.91 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.91 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.30 | 601/1579 | 4.30 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.30 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 643/1518 | 4.64 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.64 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 546/1520 | 4.91 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.91 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 230/1517 | 4.82 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.82 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 276/1550 | 4.82 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.82 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.22 | 481/1295 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.22 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 172/1398 | 4.89 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.89 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 248/1391 | 4.89 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.89 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 5.00 | |

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 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 7 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 2 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 12 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 7 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101
 Title INTERVIEWING
 Instructor: CARLTON, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1424
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1444/1639 | 3.60 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.60 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1484/1583 | 3.25 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.25 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.40 | 1510/1532 | 2.40 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 2.40 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 1051/1504 | 3.75 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 490/1612 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.50 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.00 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 1141/1518 | 4.20 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.20 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 802/1520 | 4.80 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 726/1517 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.40 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 944/1550 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.20 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 217/1398 | 4.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |

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 0 | | Graduate 4 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Non-major 5 |
| Grad. | 4 | 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 601B 0101
 Title TOPICS IN SOC. COMM.PS
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1425
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 580/1532 | 4.25 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.25 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 317/1612 | 4.67 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.00 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 299/1517 | 4.75 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1295 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 119/ 958 | 4.75 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 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 | 1 Graduate 2 Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 0 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 4 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 2 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 601E 0101
 Title CORE I
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1426
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601F 0101
 Title CLIN INTERVENTION III
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1427
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.10 | 1068/1639 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.10 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 316/1639 | 4.70 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.70 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.55 | 434/1583 | 4.55 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.55 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 3.73 | 1081/1532 | 3.73 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 3.73 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 4.09 | 775/1504 | 4.09 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.09 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 3.80 | 1133/1579 | 3.80 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.80 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 3.88 | 1327/1518 | 3.88 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 3.88 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.33 | 1318/1520 | 4.33 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.75 | 1260/1517 | 3.75 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 3.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3.13 | 1428/1550 | 3.13 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.13 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.10 | 577/1295 | 4.10 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.10 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 3.50 | 1106/1398 | 3.50 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 462/1391 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.70 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 459/1388 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.70 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 577/ 958 | 3.80 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.80 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 44/ 85 | 4.80 | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 34/ 82 | 4.80 | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.74 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.00 | 53/ 78 | 4.00 | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.00 | 58/ 80 | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/ 82 | 5.00 | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.37 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 8020
 Title PROF HUMAN RES PRACTIC
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1428
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 7 | 4.88 | 196/1639 | 4.88 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.88 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4.13 | 992/1639 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.13 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 182/1397 | 4.88 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.88 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 355/1583 | 4.63 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.63 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 469/1532 | 4.38 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.38 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 514/1504 | 4.38 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.38 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.50 | 1399/1612 | 3.50 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.50 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.38 | 1257/1635 | 4.38 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.38 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 205/1579 | 4.71 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.71 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.75 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 299/1517 | 4.75 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 436/1295 | 4.29 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.29 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 177/1398 | 4.88 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.88 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 258/1391 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 119/ 958 | 4.75 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 4.75 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 85 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 47/ 82 | 4.50 | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.74 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 80 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 82 | 5.00 | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.37 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 8020
 Title INTRO TO INDUS/ORG PSY
 Instructor: ALONSO, SHIRLEY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1429
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3.90 | 1252/1639 | 3.90 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.90 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 371/1583 | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 146/1532 | 4.80 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.80 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.20 | 667/1504 | 4.20 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.20 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 166/1612 | 4.80 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.80 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 811/1635 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.80 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 312/1579 | 4.57 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 371/1517 | 4.70 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.70 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.60 | 522/1550 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 209/1295 | 4.63 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.63 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 242/1398 | 4.78 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.78 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.67 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 244/1388 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.89 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 380/ 958 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 4.20 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.58 | **** | |

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 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 0 | | Graduate 4 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 2 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 6 |
| Grad. | 4 | 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 605 0101
 Title LEARNING AND COGNITION
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1430
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3.50 | 1497/1639 | 3.50 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4.07 | 1044/1639 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.07 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4.13 | 906/1397 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.13 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 3.60 | 1367/1583 | 3.60 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 3.87 | 942/1532 | 3.87 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 3.87 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3.91 | 945/1504 | 3.91 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.91 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 90/1612 | 4.93 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.93 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4.86 | 736/1635 | 4.86 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.86 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3.55 | 1298/1579 | 3.55 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.55 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4.20 | 1141/1518 | 4.20 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.20 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67 | 1033/1520 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 3.73 | 1268/1517 | 3.73 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 3.73 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 3.60 | 1297/1550 | 3.60 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.60 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.14 | 1138/1295 | 3.14 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.14 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3.50 | 1106/1398 | 3.50 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 3.79 | 1132/1391 | 3.79 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 3.79 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.07 | 925/1388 | 4.07 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.07 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 841/ 958 | 3.00 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 3.96 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 606 0101
 Title ADULT PSYCHOPATHOLOGY
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1431
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1326/1639 | 3.80 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3.60 | 1444/1639 | 3.60 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.60 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1449/1583 | 3.40 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.40 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3.80 | 989/1532 | 3.80 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 3.80 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3.20 | 1358/1504 | 3.20 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.20 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 882/1612 | 4.20 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.20 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 811/1635 | 4.80 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.80 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3.40 | 1364/1579 | 3.40 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.40 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1237/1518 | 4.00 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.40 | 1500/1520 | 3.40 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 3.40 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1215/1550 | 3.80 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.80 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 221/1295 | 4.60 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.60 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1271/1398 | 3.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 752/1391 | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 496/1388 | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 456/ 958 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 607 0101
 Title DEV PSYCHOPATHOLOGY
 Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1432
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 1 | 3.83 | 1303/1639 | 3.83 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 177/1639 | 4.83 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 209/1397 | 4.83 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.83 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 371/1583 | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4.00 | 824/1504 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 166/1612 | 4.80 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.80 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 1067/1635 | 4.60 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.60 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 657/1579 | 4.25 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.25 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 315/1518 | 4.83 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 725/1520 | 4.83 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 214/1517 | 4.83 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.83 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 253/1550 | 4.83 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.83 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 398/1295 | 4.33 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.33 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 611 0101
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1433
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 10 | 4.83 | 231/1639 | 4.83 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 435/1639 | 4.58 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.58 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 4.33 | 722/1397 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.33 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 392/1583 | 4.58 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.58 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4.08 | 714/1532 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.08 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 306/1504 | 4.58 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.58 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 317/1612 | 4.67 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.55 | 342/1579 | 4.55 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.55 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 602/1518 | 4.67 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.92 | 491/1520 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.92 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 498/1517 | 4.58 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.58 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 457/1550 | 4.67 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.67 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 305/1295 | 4.45 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.45 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.11 | 728/1398 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.11 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.67 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 496/1388 | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 456/ 958 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 3.49 | 4.11 | 3.96 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.72 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.74 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 611L 0101
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC. I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1434
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 951/1639 | 4.20 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.20 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 795/1397 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 792/1583 | 4.25 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 701/1504 | 4.17 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.17 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 259/1612 | 4.71 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.71 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 3.89 | 1071/1579 | 3.89 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.89 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 745/1518 | 4.56 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4.33 | 1318/1520 | 4.33 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | 1016/1517 | 4.11 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.11 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4.22 | 920/1550 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.22 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4.22 | 481/1295 | 4.22 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.22 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.67 | 1030/1398 | 3.67 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.67 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.33 | 752/1391 | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 4.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 725/ 958 | 3.50 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.50 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | 186/ 224 | 3.67 | 3.78 | 4.10 | 4.43 | 3.67 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 216/ 240 | 3.33 | 3.49 | 4.11 | 3.96 | 3.33 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 179/ 219 | 4.00 | 3.93 | 4.44 | 4.23 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 215 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 184/ 198 | 3.33 | 3.92 | 4.18 | 4.74 | 3.33 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | A 5 | Required for Majors | 2 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 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 | | 5 |
| Grad. | 7 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 1 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 0 | Other | 8 |

Course-Section: PSYC 620 0101
 Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1435
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 4.33 | 814/1639 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.33 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4.00 | 1090/1639 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 371/1583 | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 236/1532 | 4.67 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.67 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 701/1504 | 4.17 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.17 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | 913/1612 | 4.17 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.17 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.33 | 569/1579 | 4.33 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.33 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 602/1518 | 4.67 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 474/1517 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.83 | 783/1295 | 3.83 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.83 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 770/1398 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 887/1388 | 4.17 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.17 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 380/ 958 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 4.20 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 623 0101
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN II
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1436
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 814/1639 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.33 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3.78 | 1344/1639 | 3.78 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.78 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3.75 | 1261/1583 | 3.75 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.75 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 398/1532 | 4.44 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.44 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.89 | 958/1504 | 3.89 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.89 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 1519/1612 | 3.00 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 527/1579 | 4.38 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.38 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4.33 | 1021/1518 | 4.33 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.33 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 1033/1520 | 4.67 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4.22 | 917/1517 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.22 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.44 | 716/1550 | 4.44 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.44 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.14 | 708/1398 | 4.14 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.14 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.67 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 496/1388 | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 577/ 958 | 3.80 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.80 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 5 | 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 | 0 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 7 |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 8 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 635 0101
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1437
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 7 | 7 | 4.40 | 754/1639 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.40 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4.00 | 1090/1639 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1397 | **** | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3.93 | 1113/1583 | 3.93 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.93 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 377/1532 | 4.47 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.47 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 3.93 | 908/1504 | 3.93 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.93 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3.47 | 1415/1612 | 3.47 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.47 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3.93 | 1005/1579 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.93 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.75 | 1368/1518 | 3.75 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 3.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 890/1520 | 4.75 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.75 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.75 | 1260/1517 | 3.75 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 3.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.00 | 1077/1550 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | 838/1295 | 3.75 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.75 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4.07 | 749/1398 | 4.07 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.07 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 332/1391 | 4.80 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 4.33 | 783/1388 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.33 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3.71 | 636/ 958 | 3.71 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.71 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 52/ 85 | 4.50 | 4.77 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 36/ 82 | 4.75 | 4.68 | 4.52 | 4.74 | 4.75 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 71/ 78 | 3.50 | 3.75 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 3.50 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 55/ 80 | 4.25 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.25 | 82/ 82 | 2.25 | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.37 | 2.25 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 5 | Required for Majors | 4 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | B 8 | | Graduate 6 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 9 |
| Grad. | 6 | 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 651 0101
 Title COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1438
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3.83 | 1303/1639 | 3.83 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.83 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3.75 | 1357/1639 | 3.75 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.75 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.63 | 1238/1397 | 3.63 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 3.63 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.80 | 1226/1583 | 3.80 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.80 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | 1303/1504 | 3.33 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.17 | 913/1612 | 4.17 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.17 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 884/1635 | 4.75 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.75 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 3.22 | 1430/1579 | 3.22 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.22 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4.00 | 1237/1518 | 4.00 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 1129/1520 | 4.58 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.58 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3.33 | 1405/1517 | 3.33 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 3.33 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.50 | 1328/1550 | 3.50 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2.38 | 1259/1295 | 2.38 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 2.38 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3.55 | 1093/1398 | 3.55 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.55 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.55 | 1208/1391 | 3.55 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 3.55 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3.45 | 1205/1388 | 3.45 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 3.45 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3.22 | 813/ 958 | 3.22 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.22 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | A 8 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | B 0 | | 6 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 8 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Non-major 14 |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 1 | Other | 10 |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 680 0101
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1439
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.20 | 1578/1639 | 3.20 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1579/1639 | 3.00 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1532/1583 | 3.00 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.50 | 1241/1532 | 3.50 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1415/1504 | 3.00 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.75 | 1279/1612 | 3.75 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 725/1579 | 4.20 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 947/1518 | 4.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 726/1517 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 944/1550 | 4.20 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 978/1295 | 3.50 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 1271/1398 | 3.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 616/1391 | 4.50 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 456/ 958 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 741 0101
 Title TOPICS IN BEH MED
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1440
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.80 | 1622/1639 | 2.80 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 2.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.60 | 1623/1639 | 2.60 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 2.60 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.60 | 1491/1532 | 2.60 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 2.60 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | 1471/1504 | 2.67 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 2.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1612 | **** | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | **** | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 1396/1635 | 4.20 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.20 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.50 | 1318/1579 | 3.50 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.50 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.40 | 1505/1518 | 2.40 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 2.40 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3.60 | 1485/1520 | 3.60 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 3.60 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1453/1517 | 3.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 3.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 1440/1550 | 3.00 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 1158/1295 | 3.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 929/1398 | 3.80 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 863/1391 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.20 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.60 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 784 0101
 Title INTERV:INFANCY/E CHILD
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1441
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1397 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1583 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 276/1532 | 4.60 | 4.09 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.60 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 5.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 5.00 | 4.28 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.71 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.00 | 4.05 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.49 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1295 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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