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

			Fr	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_		_	_	_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	6	7	9	33	25		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		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		1308/1397		4.25	4.28	4.18	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	25	7	3 7	11	23	11		1406/1583		4.19	4.19	4.01	3.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	3	2		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 10	2	8	15	5		1278/1504		4.02	4.05	3.78	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6 6	1 2	0	5 2	19 2	24 61	20 12		1399/1612		4.28	4.16	4.10 4.56	3.50 4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	6	∠ 5	26	19	5		1466/1635 1440/1579	4.56 3.93	4.71 4.05	4.65 4.08		3.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	0	5	20	19	5	3.20	1440/15/9	3.93	4.05	4.00	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		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	47	0	1.0	1	0	_	4	2 20	1265/1200	2 (2	4 00	4 07	2 05	2 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47 46	0	18 14	1 6	9 8	6 7	4		1365/1398 1376/1391		4.08 4.36	4.07 4.30	3.85 4.07	2.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	12	0	11	8	9		1313/1388	4.18	4.42	4.28	4.07	3.05
4. Were special techniques successful	48	24	3	0	5	2	-		****/ 958				3.71	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	24	3	U	5	2	3	3.13	7 950	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	****
Quantity and														
Seminar	0.2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	1 77	/ E0	4 E0	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	83 83	0 1	1 1	0	0	0	1	1.00	****/ 85 ****/ 82	****	4.77 4.68	4.58 4.52	4.50 4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	83	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 82	****	4.42	4.16	3.90	****
5. Were effected for grading made effect	03	_	_	Ü	O	O	O	1.00	, 02		1.00	1.10	3.70	
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	****
- 10 - 1														
Self Paced	0.0	•	-	0	•	•	0	2 02		als als als 1	ale ale ale a	4 45	4 = 4	also also also also
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	∠.00	****/ 21	* * * *	* * * *	4.52	5.00	^ ^ * *

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	2	А	21	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	4						

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 Quest:	ionnaire
----------------------------------	----------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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		1383/1612		4.28	4.16	4.10	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	34	0	0	0	0	2	57		265/1635		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		1166/1520	4.76	4.72	4.70	4.61	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	1		13	18	22		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		4.35	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		****/1388		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		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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		****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

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

			Fre	que	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	83	0	0	3	8	8	45	4.48	642/1639		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 85	2 38	1 1	2 1	7 6	20 2	30	4.27	571/1532 ****/1504	4.13	4.09	4.01	3.88	4.27 ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	85 85	38 0	0	3	12	20	14 27	4.13	934/1612	3.37 3.98	4.02 4.28	4.05 4.16	3.78 4.10	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	84	2	0	0	0	16	45	4.15	913/1635	4.56	4.20	4.16	4.10	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		1	0	0	1	23	38	4.60	292/1579		4.71	4.08	3.95	4.60
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	01	_	U	U		23	50	1.00	292/13/9	3.73	1.05	1.00	3.93	1.00
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	1.40	0	•	•	•	0	_	F 00		als als als als	2 50	4 10	2 00	***
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	140	2	0	0	0	0	5 3		****/ 224	****	3.78	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0 1	0	0 1	0	4	3		****/ 240 ****/ 219	****	3.49	4.11	4.01	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	140 140	1	0	0	0	2	4		****/ 215	****	4.28	4.44 4.35	4.44 4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	140	0	0	0	0	1	6		****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.43	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	140	U	U	U	U		U	1.00	/ 190		3.72	1.10	1.23	
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		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	143	0	0	0	1	2	1			****	****	4.05	3.51	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	143	0	0	1	0	0	3		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	143	2	0	0	0	2	0	1.00		****	****	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		****/ 32	****	****	4.45	4.54	***
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	4.20	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	142	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****
		-	-	-	_	_	-		, 21					

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FORYS, KELLY

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 1370 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	561/1639		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		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		****/1504		4.02	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	23		249/1612		4.28	4.16	4.10	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	15	13		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		4.93
5. Did additioning teening the second	_	O	O	O	U	2	20	1.75	03/12/3	1.20	1.11	3.71	3.01	1.55
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		****/ 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		****/ 219	****	3.93	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 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	****
Openia a su														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	٥٦	2	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 85	****	1 77	4 50	4 50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25 26	1	0	0	0	1	1 1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.77 4.68	4.58	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	1	0	0	1	0		, -	****	3.75	4.52 4.47	4.12 4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	4.42	4.47	4.25	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	,	****	4.42	4.16	3.90	****
J. Were Criteria for grading made crear	20	U	U				U	3.00	/ 02		1.00	4.10	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		****/ 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	****

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FORYS, KELLY

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 29

O TO PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County
S, KELLY Fall 2007

Page 1370 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	А	16	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

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	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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		4.71	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		4.49	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		4.72	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		4.35	4.27	4.34	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	6	5	16	22		1029/1550		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		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		4.36	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		4.42	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	****

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: BEALL, LISA C

Enrollment: 97
Questionnaires: 57

97

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Page 1371 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque	encie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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			4.25	834/1388		4.42	4.28	4.37	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	2	0	1	7	9	8	3.96	486/ 958			3.93		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		****/ 80	****	4.42	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****
Frequ	encv	, Dis	trib	utic	n									
•		210												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	easor	າຣ 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
0.007		_					-	2	~ 1 .		^			1.0

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	А	16	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	С	5	General	7	Under-grad	63	Non-major	47
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	24	-	_		
				2	2						

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor:

Baltimore County ELDER, CHARLOTT Fall 2007

Page 1373 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 83 Questionnaires: 41

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions					Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did 2. B 11 17 3.99 [1847/183] 4.05 4.22 4.22 4.27 3.95 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Nas the grading system clearly explained 7. Nas the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was cleas cancelled 8.		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did 2. B 11 17 3.99 [1847/183] 4.05 4.22 4.22 4.27 3.95 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Nas the grading system clearly explained 7. Nas the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was cleas cancelled 8.																	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 2 2 8 11 17 3.97 141/1639 4.05 4.22 4.27 3.97 3. Did the exame questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 5 5 11 17 3.97 141/1639 4.05 4.22 4.22 4.27 3.97 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 4.18 4.41 5. Did assignments contribute to what you learned 2 17 0 0 0 4 5 13 4.41 597/1583 4.06 4.19 4.19 4.19 4.28 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 0 1 2 0 1 2 2 1 7 1 9 8 4.05 1270/1503 3.75 4.05 4.08 4.10 4.28 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 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 0 0 5 11 9 8 3.01 1270/1579 3.75 4.05 4.08 4.10 4.28 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 3 3 5 5 27 4.47 849/1518 4.55 4.49 4.42 4.48 4.47 2. Did the instructor neem interested in the subject 4 0 1 1 6 7 22 4.30 1341/1520 4.56 4.72 4.70 4.78 4.30 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 1 1 6 7 22 4.30 1341/1520 4.56 4.72 4.70 4.78 4.30 3. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 1 6 9 20 4.24 905/1550 4.17 4.42 4.35 4.27 4.34 4.40 4. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 1 2 5 8 15 4.00 738/1398 3.87 4.08 4.07 4.14 4.10 4. Were special techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 1 1 3 4 11 19 4.28 4.37 4.37 4.34 4.39 4.07 4.45 4. Were special techniques enhance the what you learned 10 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 1		, ,	-	•	0	0	1.0	0	1.0	4 05	1100/1600	4 10	4 00	4 00	4 25	4 05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 5 5 11 17 3,90 0x60,1397 4.00 4.25 4.28 4.39 3.90						-											
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		_	-		-	_	_	-									
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0. Did writte to subject 1. Did writte to what you learned 1. Did writte to was you learned 1. Did writte to was you learned 1. Did writte to was you learned 1. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did written would be written would written would be written would written would be written would written would written would be written wo		-	-														
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 2 6 9 2 11 42 1872/1612 4.10 4.28 4.16 4.1 4.21 4.21 872/1612 4.10 4.28 4.16 4.1 4.21 4.21 872/1612 4.10 4.28 4.16 4.1 4.21 4.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_	-					_									
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	_	_	-														
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 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 5 11 9 8 3.61 1273/1635 4.63 4.71 4.65 4.63 4.36 18 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 5 11 9 8 3.61 1273/1635 4.63 4.71 4.65 4.63 4.36 18 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 5 11 9 8 3.61 1273/1635 4.63 4.71 4.65 4.63 4.36 18 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 5 11 9 8 3.61 1273/1635 4.63 4.71 4.65 4.63 4.36 18 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		_	-			-	-										
9. flow 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 2.61 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 1 3 3 5 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 3 0 1 1 6 7 22 4.30 1341/1520 4.58 4.72 4.70 4.78 4.20 3 0 1 1 6 7 22 4.30 1341/1520 4.58 4.72 4.70 4.78 4.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 1 1 1 6 9 20 4.24 905/1550 4.17 4.35 4.27 4.34 4.42 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 1 1 6 9 20 4.28 443/1295 4.31 4.11 3.94 4.07 4.28 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 3 2 3 8 15 4 3.93 1040/1591 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 2 2 4.45 693/1388 4.40 4.42 4.28 4.37 4.45 4. Were special techniques successful 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 39 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.	_		a		-	_	_	-				. , .					
Lecture Lecture Lecture Lectures well prepared 3 0 0 3 3 5 27 4.47 849/1518 4.55 4.49 4.43 4.48 4.47 2.78 4.70 4.78 4.75 4.7	-		a offoativonoaa				-										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seems 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 4.38 3.0 1 1 1 6 7 22 4.30 1341/1520 4.58 4.72 4.70 4.78 4.30 3.0 4.81 lectures material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 1 6 7 22 4.30 1341/1520 4.58 4.72 4.70 4.78 4.30 3.0 4.81 lectures 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 5.01 daudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 1 1 1 4 11 19 4.28 443/1295 4.31 4.11 3.94 4.07 4.28 Discussion 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 2.93 1040/1391 4.03 4.26 4.30 4.35 3.93 2.04 dhe instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 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 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.77 4.58 4.00 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0.0 ***/ 52 **** 4.75 4.58 4.00 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9. How would you	grade the overall teachin	g effectiveness	,		U	5	тт	9	0	3.01	12/0/15/9	3.75	4.05	4.00	4.14	3.01
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 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0		Lecture															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 bid and the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 bid and the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 bid and the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 bid 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 1.00 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01	1. Were the inst	ructor's lectures well pre	pared	3	0	0	3	3	5	27	4.47	849/1518	4.55	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 1 1 1 4 11 19 4.28 905/1550 4.17 4.35 4.22 4.33 4.24 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 1 1 1 4 11 19 4.28 943/1295 4.31 4.11 3.94 4.07 4.28 Discussion	2. Did the instr	uctor seem interested in t	he subject	4	0	1	1	6	7	22	4.30	1341/1520	4.58	4.72	4.70	4.78	4.30
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 3.01 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 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60	3. Was lecture m	aterial presented and expl	ained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	7	25	4.42	700/1517	4.42	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.42
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6. 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 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.05 4.28 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40. 0. 1. 0. 0. 0. 2.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 **** **** **** **** **** **** ****	4. Did the lectu	res 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
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 ****/ 53 **** 4.05 4.28 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 ***** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did audiovisu	al 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
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 ****/ 53 **** 4.05 4.28 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 ***** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		Diamondo															
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 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 1 3 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 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 **** 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 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.55 4.28 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.55 **** 4.55 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.56 ***** 4.56 ***** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1 Did alaga dia		t was learned	10	Λ	1	2	5	0	1 5	4 10	720/1200	2 07	4 NO	4 07	1 11	4 10
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 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 **** 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 **** 4.75 **** **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors One of the contribute to what you learned 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-		-	_	_	-									
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 **** 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 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.05 4.28 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 40 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.28 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors One-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 Each 1 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 Each 2 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 B4-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					-	-	_	-	-			,					
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 39 0 2 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 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 40 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 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 O0-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		9	pen discussion														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 39 0 2 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.49 4.11 4.47 **** Seminar	i. Were special	ccciniiques successiui			23	O	_	,	_		3.37	, ,50	3.70	1.11	3.75	1.00	
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 ****		Laboratory															
Field Work	2. Were you prov	ided with adequate backgro	und information	39	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.49	4.11	4.47	****
Field Work																	
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 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 O0-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1 77			20	_	0	0	1	_	_	2 00	**** OF		4 77	4 50	4 00	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 1 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 O0-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1. were assigned	topics relevant to the an	nounced theme	38	2	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	^^^^/ 85	, ^^^^	4.//	4.58	4.00	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 40 0 1 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 O0-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1. Did field exp		vou learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
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 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	_		-						0	0		, -		****			****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 40 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 **** **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	_	-			0	0		0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75		****
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 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	5. Did conferenc	es help you carry out fiel	d activities	40	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
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 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant																	
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	4 -13 36						_										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1. Did self-pace	d system contribute to wha	t you learned	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 12 Required for Majors 8 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
00-27			1														
28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
28-55 10 1.00-1.99 1 B 13 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	00-27	0 00-0 99 1	 а 12			anir		 or M	 a ior		 Ω	Gradust	Α	0	Maic Maic		5
56-83 5 2.00-2.99 7 C 7 General 6 Under-grad 41 Non-major 36 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1					1/6/	quit!	Lu I	OT M	۱۰ ۲۰۰۲	D	J	Graduat		U	Ma J) <u>+</u>	J
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 5 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					Ger	nera	1				6	Under-a	rad 4	11	Non-	-maior	36
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			· ·								-					5	
P 0 responses to be significant							ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	_i h
			P 0													_	
		I 0		Ot1	her				2	0:0	_						

? 0

Course-Section: PSYC 205 0101 Title BEFORE WE WERE BORN

University of Maryland Page 1374 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

3

Instr	ructor	•	FREIBERG,	KAREN	
Enrol	lment	:	36		
	_	_			_

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	25

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

	Questions						Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	22	4.76	305/1639	4.76	4.29	4.27	4.35	4.76
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	496/1639	4.52	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.52
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	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 o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	14	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	434/1583	4.55	4.19	4.19	4.28	4.55
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	19	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1504	****	4.02	4.05	4.09	****
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	1	6	17	4.52	469/1612	4.52	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.52
8. How m	many times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	1	19	5	4.16	1415/1635	4.16	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.16
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	590/1579	4.32	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.32
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.78	5.00
				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 t	he lectur	es contribute t	o 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 a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	179/1295	4.68	4.11	3.94	4.07	4.68
		Discus																
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				ed to participate	16	0	0	0	2	3	4		839/1391	4.22	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.22
		_		d open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	1	7		609/1388	4.56	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.56
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		16	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	***	4.11	3.93	4.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	·	0.00-0.99	0	. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —				ed f	 or M			4	 Graduat		0	Majo		6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 9		Ked	4ull (eu I	OT I	a joi	D	4	Graduat	C	U	Majo	JΤ	O
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Cer	nera	1			1	.3	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0		Gei	ici a.	_			1		onder -g	144 2		14011	ilia JOI	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				2	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
orua.	Ü	3.30 1.00	_	P 1								-	respons				_	,
				* ±									TCDFOILD		5191	cai		

Other

I 0

? 0

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101 University of Maryland Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1375

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN Enrollment: 75

Questionnaires: 51

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	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		4.02	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		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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	28	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	36	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201 University of Maryland Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S

Enrollment: 75 Questionnaires: 44

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1376

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
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	****
7		- -												

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	22	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	36	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 210H 0101 University of Maryland Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING Baltimore County

Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1377

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	\$		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights, skil	ls 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 th	e instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.25
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	795/1397	4.25	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.25
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.19	4.19	4.28	4.57
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to w	hat 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contri	bute 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 th	e grading	system clearly	explai explai	ned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.75
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.71	4.65	4.63	4.88
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	l teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	783/1579	4.14	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.14
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1327/1518	3.88	4.49	4.43	4.48	3.88
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520		4.72	4.70	4.78	5.00
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.00
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.35	4.22	4.33	4.00
			_	ur understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.11	3.94	4.07	4.50
		Discuss	ui on															
1 Did al	agg diggs			hat you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.14	4 00
				to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1391			4.30	4.35	5.00
				open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.67
		chniques succes		open discussion	5	2	0	0	0	1	_		****/ 958		4.11	3.93		****
1. Were b	peciai ce	ciniiques succes	BLUI		3	2	O	Ü	O	-	Ü	1.00	/ 550		1.11	3.75	1.00	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Per	 สมร์ ห		or Ma	iors		0	Graduat		0	Majo		4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000	quii	Ju I	OI MC	CJOIL	,	O	Graduat	_	O	Maje	,_	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	ı				0	Under-q	rad	8	Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001	u.	_				-	onacr 9		~	1,011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	zes				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
	-	2.22	-	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I 0		Otl	her					7			3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 215 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C

Instructor: LEISEY, KIM

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 37

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1378

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 18		Re	quir	ed fo	 or M	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 12			_			-						_		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26	_			
				?	1						

Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C

Instructor: LEISEY, KIM

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1379 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	E	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	4.72	4.27	4.76	4.70
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	
5. 214 dudiovipudi ocominance four underpounding	ŭ	_	Ü	Ü	J			1.55	303, 12,3	1.05		3.71	1.07	1.55
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	Ο	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		****/ 240	****	3.49	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 219	****	3.93	4.44	4.61	****
•														
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt.i or	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 216 0101 University of Maryland FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS

Ρ

I

0

0

Title Baltimore County Instructor: LENNON, NICK (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Page 1380

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Grad.

3.50-4.00

						Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 l															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	3	0	2	1	1	7	4	3.67	1416/1639	3.67	4.29	4.27	4.35	3.67
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1044/1639	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.07
		uestions reflec		-	3	6	0	3	1	1	4	3.67	1219/1397	3.67	4.25	4.28	4.39	3.67
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	3	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.19	4.19	4.28	3.67
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ate 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 wi	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	3	0	0	4	3	2	6	3.67	1327/1612	3.67	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.67
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.71	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1359/1579	3.66	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.66
		Lecture	2															
1 Were t	the instri	actor's lecture	nrenared	3	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	863/1518	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.45	
		ctor seem inter		3	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	925/1520	4.55	4.72	4.70	4.78	4.55	
			explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	947/1517	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.14	
		es contribute to			3	0	1	2	1	6	5		1215/1550		4.35	4.22		3.72
				our understanding	3	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00			4.11	3.94	4.07	
		_																
		Discus																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398		4.08	4.07	4.14	4.80
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.33
		_		nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	4		647/1388		4.42	4.28	4.37	4.50
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	sstul		12	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.11	3.93	4.00	4.50
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utior	n									
Credits I	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						quir	ed fo	or Ma	.jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r)r	2
28-55							_			-						3		
56-83								1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														

Electives

Other

Course-Section: PSYC 216 0101 University of Maryland

Page 1381 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	18			
Ouestionnaires:	18	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

					Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did	vou gain n	new insights,ski		om this course	3	0	2	1	1	7	4	3 67	1416/1639	3.67	4.29	4.27	4.35	3.67
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	3	5	6		1044/1639	4.07	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.07
		ruestions reflect			3	6	0	3	1	1	4		1219/1397	3.67	4.25	4.28	4.39	3.67
		uations reflect		_	3	0	1	1	4	5	4		1324/1583	3.67	4.19	4.19	4.28	3.67
				what you learned	3	0	1	1	7	1	5		1223/1532		4.09	4.01	4.09	3.53
	_	-		to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	3	3		1303/1504		4.02	4.05	4.09	3.33
		g system clearly		-	3	0	0	4	3	2	6		1327/1612		4.28	4.16	4.21	3.67
	_	was class cance	_		3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635		4.71	4.65	4.63	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	8	1		1056/1579		4.05	4.08		3.66
		Lecture				_						0.0 0 / 0.5 0.0						
	e the instr		4	0	0	0	4	0	10	4.43	919/1518		4.49	4.43	4.48	4.45		
		in the subject	4	0	0	2	0	3	9		1305/1520	4.55	4.72	4.70	4.78	4.55		
		_		explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	4	-/		1042/1517	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.14
		es contribute to		•	4	0	1	3	1	4	5		1281/1550	3.72	4.35	4.22	4.33	3.72
5. Did	audiovisua	ıl techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	4	0	0	2	1	6	5	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.11	3.94	4.07	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.08	4.07	4.14	4.80
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.33
		_	_	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.50
		echniques succes			12	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.11	3.93	4.00	4.50
	-																	
			Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	ution	1										
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	}
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						~	ed fo				0	Graduat		0	Majo	~~~~~	2
	28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 5						1urr	eu I	J⊈ I¥lč	a JOF	D	U	Graduat	E	U	Ma JC	ıΤ	۷
	56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 1						nerai	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	major	16
84-150	-	3.00-3.49	6	D 0		GEI	a.	-				•	onaci -g.	Luu I		14011		10
01 130	J	3.00 3.19	U	D 0														

Electives

Other

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

Title Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA Fall 2007

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1382

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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
_														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101 University of Maryland ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

64

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1383

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R

				Fr	eque:	ncie	· C		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evre l	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
	General															
 Did you gain new 			0	0	0	3	3	11	12		1068/1639			4.27	4.35	4.10
Did the instruct		_	0	0	0	2	6	7	14		,		4.22	4.22	4.27	4.14
Did the exam que	stions 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 evalua	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	25	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1583	3.93	4.19	4.19	4.28	****
5. Did assigned rea	dings 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 assi	gnments 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 expl	ained	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 w	as 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 gr	ade the overall tea	ching 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 instruc	tor'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 instruct	or 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 mate	rial 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	_		0	0	3	3	1	9	13	3.90	1166/1550	4.19	4.35	4.22	4.33	3.90
5. Did audiovisual		-	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 discus	sions 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 student			8	0		3	3		7		1065/1391		4.36	4.30	4.35	3.90
3. Did the instruct			9	0	0	0	1		12	4.55	,			4.28	4.37	4.55
4. Were special tec	ma open alboabbion	9	11	1	0	3	2		3.67	,			3.93	4.00	3.67	
		Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio:	n									
		1														
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	29	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	1						

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: RESTA, PETER

Enrollment: 84
Questionnaires: 79

Fall 2007

Page 1384 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General			_	_		_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	44	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	293/1639	4.32		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		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		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	U	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		****/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		****/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		****/ 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		****/ 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	U	0	0	U	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	****	****
Cole Parad														
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		****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
1 John Company of the Line of the L		ŭ	ŭ	-	ŭ	Ū	ŭ		, 13			1.00		

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

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	22	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

DAHLQUIST, LYNN Instructor:

Enrollment:

66 Questionnaires: 42 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1385 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Ctudont	COLLEGA	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n \circ i r \circ

			NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Question																
		Genera																
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	9	31	4.69	391/1639		4.29	4.27	4.35	4.69
		ctor make clear sestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0 1	4	15 11	25 26	4.55 4.48	476/1639 560/1397		4.22	4.22	4.27 4.39	4.55 4.48
	_	ations reflect			0	15	0	1	2	4	20	4.48	381/1583		4.25	4.28	4.39	4.48
				what you learned	1	1	2	0	4	10	24	4.35	488/1532		4.19	4.19	4.20	4.35
	_	-		o what you learned	0	18	1	1	2	6	14	4.29	576/1504		4.02	4.05	4.09	4.29
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	1	2	10	29	4.60	398/1612		4.28	4.16	4.03	4.60
		was class cand		inea	1	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	529/1635		4.71	4.65	4.63	4.93
	_			hing effectiveness	9	0	1	0	1	12	19	4.45	439/1579		4.05	4.08	4.14	4.45
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	257/1518	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.48	4.88
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	1	38	4.93	437/1520		4.72	4.70	4.78	4.93
		xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	33	4.80	239/1517		4.35	4.27	4.34	4.80		
		you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	36	4.88	208/1550	4.19	4.35	4.22	4.33	4.88		
			our understanding	2	3	0	0	5	8	24	4.51			4.11	3.94	4.07	4.51	
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass discu	what vou learned	17	0	1	0	2	8	14	4.36	539/1398	3.57	4.08	4.07	4.14	4.36		
	d class discussions contribute to what you lear re all students actively encouraged to particip					0	1	1	2	6	14	4.29	785/1391	3.69	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.29
				d open discussion	18 17	0	0	1	2	3	19	4.60	571/1388	4.07	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.60
		chniques succe			18	7	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	540/ 958		4.11	3.93	4.00	3.88
		Labora	itory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.49	4.11	4.47	****
		Semina	ır															
2. Was th	ne instruc	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	3.00	****
4. Did pr	resentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.42	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	le clear		41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.08	4.16	4.00	****
		Self	Paced															
	_	-		what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did st	udy quest	cions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was th	ne feedbac	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Red		ed f	 or M	 aior	 s 1	3	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	15
28-55										- 5	-) (
56-83						Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 4	12	Non-	-major	27
84-150	4-150 1 3.00-3.49 5 D 0												3				3 -	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	rh
				P 0 T 0		O+1					-	2	respons	es co l	be sigr	ıııcar	IL	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.2						

?

1

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: ARNHEIM, DANIEL

Instructor: ARNHE Enrollment: 85

Enrollment: 85
Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 1386 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights, skil	ls from	this course	1	0	2	6	10	20	14	3.73	1371/	1639	4.32	4.29	4.27	4.35	3.73
		ctor make clear			1	0	5	9	20	12	6				4.14	4.22	4.22		3.10
		uestions reflect			1	0	6	11	10	18	7				4.13		4.28		3.17
	_	uations reflect	_		1	23	3	2	10	11			1469/			4.19	4.19	4.28	3.31
		eadings contribut			1	8	1	1	6	16	20		626/			4.09	4.01	4.09	4.20
				what you learned	1	26	4	3	5	9			1323/			4.02	4.05		3.31
		g system clearly			1	0	3	4		18			1371/			4.28	4.16		
	_	was class cance	_		1	0	0	0	1	34			1311/			4.71			
				ng effectiveness	5	2	4	5		15					3.93			4.14	
		Lecture																	
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures		renared	2	0	2	6	12	13	18	3 76	1364/	1510	4.50	4.49	4.43	4.48	3.76
			_	_	2	0	1	2	6	15	27		1349/			4.72	4.70	4.78	4.27
	me instructor seem interested in the cture material presented and explante lectures contribute to what you additionable techniques enhance your			2	0	4		12	16			1332/			4.35		4.34		
			2	1	10	6	11				1419/					4.33			
			2	0	3	4	9	11											
5. Did au	lalovisua	1 tecnniques enna	ir understanding	2	U	3	4	9	11	24	3.96	666/.	1295	4.36	4.11	3.94	4.07	3.96	
		Discuss																	
	lass discussions contribute to				37	0	8	0	5	1	2	2.31	1375/	1398	3.57	4.08	4.07	4.14	2.31
2. Were a	all students actively encouraged		ouraged	to participate	37	0	4	1	6	3	2	2.88	1351/	1391	3.69	4.36	4.30	4.35	2.88
		ctor encourage fa		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 s	special t	echniques succes	sful		37	14	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	958	3.77	4.11	3.93	4.00	****
		Laborato	ory																
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate	e backgr	cound information	52	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	240	****	3.49	4.11	4.47	****
		Field Wo	ork																
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute		it vou learned	52	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
	_	y understand you		_	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	53	****	****			****
2. 214 70		, anaciboana , ca		01100114	32	Ū	Ü	Ū	_	Ü	Ū	3.00	,				1.05	1.20	
		Self Pa				_				_	_								
	_	system contribut		_	52	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	,	50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did st	udy ques	tions make clear	the exp	pected goal	52	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.33	***
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utic	n										
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s				Ту	pe			Majors	\$
															- 				
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	A 14		Re	equir	ed f	or M	ajor	S	9	Grad	duat	е	0	Majo	or	7
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 19 C 9				_				_	_		_	_			
56-83						Ge	nera	1			1	.1	Und	er-g	rad 5	3	Non-	-major	46
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 2																
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	.ecti	ves				1			Means t			_	βh
				P 0									res	pons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				T 0		\sim \perp	. la				_	1							

Other

24

I

?

0

2

ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY

Title Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 109

Questionnaires: 72

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1387 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	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	Ω	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		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		****/ 240	****	3.49	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	71	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.04	***
Frequ	ency	. Diet	-rih	ıt i o	n									

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	30	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	33	_			
				?	3						

Course-Section: PSYC 308 8020 University of Maryland Title CHILD MALTREATMENT

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1388 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion		MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ranl		Course	_	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean	
		Genera																	
-	_	insights,ski			1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	222/1			4.29	4.27	4.28	4.85
		or make clear			1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	199/1		4.81	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.81
		stions reflect			1	18 1	0	0	1 0	2 7	5 18	4.50			4.50	4.25 4.19	4.28	4.26 4.24	4.50 4.72
		tions reflect		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.72 4.88	281/1 113/1		4.72 4.88	4.19	4.19	4.24	4.72
				what you learned what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	118/1		4.88	4.02	4.05	4.12	4.88
		system clearly		_	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	90/1		4.92	4.28	4.16	4.12	4.92
	-	as class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1		5.00		4.65	4.66	5.00
_				hing effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	152/1	579	4.79	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.79
		Lecture	е																
		tor's lectures			1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	491/1	518	4.73	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.73
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	1		4.88	597/1		4.88	4.72	4.70	4.68	4.88
	-					0	0	0	1	5		4.73			4.73	4.35	4.27	4.23	
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					0 3	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	338/1		4.77		4.22	4.20	4.77
5. Did audi	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understa						0	1	1	3	18	4.65	191/1	295	4.65	4.11	3.94	3.95	4.65
	2.1				_					_			450/4			4 00	4 0 =		4 00
		_	1 1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	172/1		4.88	4.08	4.07	4.13	4.88		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you lea Were all students actively encouraged to partici Did the instructor encourage fair and open discu						0	0	0	3	23	4.88	248/1: 179/1:		4.88 4.92	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.88
		or encourage . hniques succes		a open discussion	1 2	0 5	0 0	0	1 1	-	25 15		143/					4.34 3.97	4.92 4.70
_		_																	
O Maria		Laborat	_		26	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/	240	****	3.49	4.11	4 00	***
2. were you	i provide	d with adequa	Le Dack	ground information	∠6	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ .	240		3.49	4.11	4.08	
		Semina																	
		s contribute			26 26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ ****/	80 82	****	4.42	4.47	4.65	****
5. were cri	iteria io	r grading made	e clear		26	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/	82	* * * *	4.08	4.16	4.08	* * * *
		Field N																	
				hat you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you	clearly	understand you	ur evalı	uation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
	_	Self 1				_	_		_										
1. Did self	-paced s	ystem contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
								utior	1										
Credits Ear	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons					Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	 jor	 s	5	Grad	uate	:	0	Majo	 r	11
28-55																	_		
56-83						Ger	neral	_				7	Unde:	r-gr	ad 2	7	Non-	major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0															
Grad.								res				0			leans t			_	ŗh
				P 0								_	resp	onse	s to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otł	ner					8							
			? 0																

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 1389

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	38		
Questionnaires:	17	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101

COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY

GRONINGER, LOWE

Title

Instructor:

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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	2	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	5	ΤŢ		1305/1520		4.49	4.43	4.39	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	4	2		1424/1517	3.25	4.72	4.70	4.00	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	Δ Λ		, -		4.35	4.22	4.20	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	2	2	5	3.57	,		4.11	3.94	3.95	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	3	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	943/1293	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
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME

Instructor: FOX, MARY H

Enrollment: 37

Questionnaires: 34

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1390 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	Λ	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		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		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		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	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.49	4.11	4.08	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	 19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	25	_			
					0						

Course-Section: PSYC 330 0101 University of Maryland CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR Baltimore County

Title Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA Fall 2007

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1391

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies I						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	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		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		4.35	4.22	4.20	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	3	18	4.68	173/1295		4.11	3.94	3.95	
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	****
P		- -	2 1											

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Expected Grades Reasons Typ					Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	1						

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	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	Ţ	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		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 1	0 1	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	Τ	Τ	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		****/ 240	3.26	3.49	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	4		****/ 219	3.63	3.93	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	0	5		****/ 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	٥	0	0	٥	1	0	4 00	****/ 32	****	****	A E1	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27 27	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 32 ****/ 43	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	۷ /	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	/ 43			4.09	5.00	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	8	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	24	=			
				2	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title

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	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect 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		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		****/ 219	3.63	3.93	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	78	1	2	0	3	1	3		****/ 215		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		****/ 78	****	3.75	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d 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	В	13						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	С	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	3						

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

Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 24

Page 1394 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	I	Fall	2007	
Student	Course	Eval	luation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Ouestions		NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean
	Questions													Mean	
	General														
1.	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course				1	3	5	15	4.42	740/1639	4.49	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.42
	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
	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
	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
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	1	5	2	3		1470/1532	3.59	4.09	4.01	4.05	2.81
	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
	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
	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														
	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
	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
	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
	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
	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
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	2	7	6		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	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
	4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		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	***

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 78 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

FEB 13, 2008

Page 1395

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		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		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 00	119/ 224	2 61	2 70	4 10	4.06	4.08
-		0	1	0	3 7	0	4	4.08		3.64		4.10		3.50
 Were you provided with adequate background information Were necessary materials available for lab activities 	13	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	206/ 240 179/ 219	3.26	3.49	$4.11 \\ 4.44$	4.08	
	12	1	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	109/ 219	3.63 3.95	3.93 4.28	4.44	4.44 4.21	4.00 4.45
 Did the lab instructor provide assistance Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 	12	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.45	61/ 198	3.95	3.92	4.35	4.21	4.45
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	12	0	U	U			4	4.50	01/ 198	3.90	3.94	4.10	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		****/ 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	***

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 78

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1395 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 24 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title

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	NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncie: 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect 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	_				_	_			405/4540					
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 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1 1	0	0	1 1	1 1	10 4	9 15	4.29 4.57	854/1517 556/1550	4.45 4.57	4.35 4.35	4.27 4.22	4.23	4.29 4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	6	4	9	4.00	623/1295	4.14		3.94		4.00
3. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding			1	U	0	-1	J	4.00	023/1293	4.14	4.11	3.74	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	4	11		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	1.0		0	-	0		-	2 68	****	****	4 55	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1 1	0 1	1 1	1		****/ 85 ****/ 82	****	4.77	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19 20	0	0		0	0	0 1		****/ 82 ****/ 78	****	4.68 3.75	$4.52 \\ 4.47$	4.59 4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1 2	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.42	4.47	4.65	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	2	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	4.08	4.16	4.08	****
		J	Ü	_	Ü	J	_	3.00	, 02		1.00	1.10	1.00	
Field Work					_		_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	1 2	0	0	0		****/ 42 ****/ 37	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19 19	1 1	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.58 4.56	4.52 4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19		U	2	U	U	U	2.00	/ 32			4.50	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.07	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	J . J .	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 43 ****/ 32	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21 20	0	0	1 1	0	0 1	0	2.00	****/ 32 ****/ 21	****	****	4.37 4.52	5.00 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	∠∪	U	U	Т	U	Т	U	3.00	/ 21			4.52	5.00	

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

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	18	0	1	4	8	Ω	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		1542/1639		4.22	4.27	4.20	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	17	0	0	2	10	8	4		1252/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	18	1	1	0	5	12	4		1219/1583		4.19	4.19	4.24	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	5	8	6	3		1374/1532		4.09	4.01	4.05	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	5	8	5	4		1337/1504		4.02	4.05	4.12	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	18	0	1	2	6	8	6		1310/1612		4.28	4.16	4.12	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	1	1	21		721/1635			4.65	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	1	3	10	3	1		1477/1579			4.08	4.07	3.00
. 3														
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		1300/1398		4.08	4.07	4.13	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	2	3	4	3	3		1302/1391		4.36	4.30	4.35	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	2	4	4	3	1		1352/1388		4.42	4.28	4.34	2.79
4. Were special techniques successful	27	4	2	3	2	2	Τ	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	Λ	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		****/ 240		3.49	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 219		3.93	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215		4.28	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198		3.92	4.18	4.04	****
o. Hore requirements for run reports creatif specifica	-0	Ü	3	J	Ü	Ü	_	2.00	, 150	1.55	3.72	1.10	1.01	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	30
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-	•	_	
				2	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 56

Fall 2007 FINGER, MARIA Y

Page 1398 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 51 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnai	Ouestionnaires:	51	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair
--	-----------------	----	-----------	--------	------------	--------------

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	22	0	1	2	4	11	11		1138/1639		4.29	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	22	0	3	6	3	6	11		1462/1639		4.22	4.22	4.20	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	22	0	3	4	3	6	13		1175/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	22	0 1	1 5	2	5 6	9 5	12 9		1010/1583		4.19	4.19	4.24	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	23 23	0	1	0	3	10	14	4.29	1300/1532 585/1504		4.09 4.02	4.01	4.12	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	23	0	3	2	4	7	12		1237/1612		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		4.71	4.65	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	3	5	5	9	2		1465/1579			4.08		3.08
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	۵,	J	3	J	J		_	3.00	1103/13/7	3.31	1.05	1.00	1.07	3.00
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		1300/1550		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	2 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		1000/1390		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		4.42	4.28	4.34	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	31	7	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	603/ 958		4.11	3.93		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		****/ 240		3.49	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	1	0	4		****/ 219		3.93	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	1	0	4		****/ 215		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		****/ 82	****	4.68	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53		****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	32
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	

I 0 Other 25

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

Comparisons No. No				Fre	anier	ncies	2		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insight, skills from this course 5	Ouestions	NR	NA		_			5				_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. D. O. 1 1 6 18 4.58 4471977 3.97 4.25 4.28 4.08 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. D. O. 1 1 6 18 4.58 4471977 3.97 4.25 4.28 4.08 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6. D. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness to 1 1 0 2 2 2 0 6 3.05 972/1532 3.44 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4	x														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7. Was the instructor's lectures well prepared 7. Did the instructor's each interested in the subject 7. Did the instructor's each interested in the subject 7. Did the lecture materials presented and explained clearly 7. Did the lecture materials presented and explained clearly 7. Did the lecture materials available to what you learned 7. Did undovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did the lab increase understanding 7. Was the instructor provide assistance 7. Did presentations contribute to wh	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	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
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Bow would you grade the overall prepared 9. So 97 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	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
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 1 0 2 2 5 20 4.54 459/1612 4.02 4.28 4.16 4.12 4.54 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 1 0 2 3 9 6 3.05 972/1579 3.34 4.05 4.08 4.07 3.95 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the lectures contribute on that you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3. Did the instructor secondary set and set as a set of the subject set of the su	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
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 10. 2 5 2 6 1.0 1/1635 4.93 4.71 4.65 4.66 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10. 10. 0 0 0 0 27 5.00 1/1635 4.93 4.71 4.65 4.66 5.00 10. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 10. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 11. Where the instructor's lectures well prepared 12. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 13. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 15. Did sudiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 16. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18. Were special techniques successful 18. Where special techniques successful 19. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 20. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21. Did the lab increase understand to the announced theme 22. Where all the discussions contribute to what you learned 23. Where necessary materials available for lab activities 24. Where you provided with adequate background information 25. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 27. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 28. Did the instructor provide assistance 29. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29.	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
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 0 75 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 0 2 3 9 6 3.95 972/1579 3.34 4.05 4.08 4.07 3.95 Lecture	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
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1 0 0 2 0 0 0 27 5.00 1/1635 4.93 4.71 4.65 4.66 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 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 1 7 7 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 10 4.18 953/1550 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 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 2 2 1 1 8 7 3.80 929/1199 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 4.09 7788/1391 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 4.22 4.23 4.24 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 0 0 1 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 1 3 5 4.44 64/ 224 4.44 3.78 4.10 4.08 4.33 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21 1 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.33 86/ 198 4.33 3.99 4.11 4.08 4.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0 0 0 1 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 7 4.78 60/ 219 4.78 3.93 4.44 4.44 4.48 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 22 0 0 0 1 0 3 5 5 4.33 86/ 198 4.33 3.99 4.11 4.08 4.33 3. Did cresearch projects contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.67 ***/ 85 *** 4.77 4.58 4.50 *** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 82 *** 4.64 4.57 4.65 *** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1 4.80 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 5.00 ***/ 82 *** 4.64 4.57 4.65 ***	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
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	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
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. 0 0 0 1 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 1 7 7 4.43 1256/1520 4.11 4.72 4.70 4.68 4.43 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Diacussion 6. Diacussion 7. Diacussion 8. Did audiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 9. Diacussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 0 3 4 12 4.30 778/1391 3.60 4.05 4.03 4.35 4.30 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0 3 4 12 4.30 778/1391 3.80 4.05 4.04 4.03 4.05 4.03 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 2. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Laboratory 2. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 2. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 2. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 2. Was the instructor available for lab activities 2. Was the instructor available for lab activities 2. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 2. Was the instructor available for lab activities 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did the lab instructor provide availation criteria 3. Did the lab instructor available for lab activities 3. Did the lab instructor avail	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
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 4.54 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.32 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.34 4	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
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 4.54 4.31 4.32 4.32 4.32 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.33 4.34 4															
2. pid the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 1 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 4.21 286/1517 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 4.18 953/1550 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 1 8 7 3.80 929/1398 3.45 4.08 4.07 4.13 3.80 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 0 0 0 1 3 5 12 4.45 702/1388 3.75 4.42 4.28 4.34 4.45 4. Were volume to the lab increase understanding of the material 21 1 0 0 1 0 3 5 4.44 64/224 4.44 3.78 4.11 4.94 3.39 3.97 2.75 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21 1 0 0 1 1 3 5 4.44 64/224 4.44 3.78 4.11 4.08 4.33 3.96 4.21 4.54 4. Were volume requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 0 0 0 1 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 5.00 ***/ 82 *** 4.68 4.52 4.59 *** 4.59 5. Were crequirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 0 0 1 0 3 5 5.00 ***/ 82 *** 4.68 4.52 4.59 *** 4.59 5. Were crequirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ***/ 82 *** 4.68 4.52 4.59 *** 4.50 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ***/ 82 *** 4.08 4.16 4.08 *** 5.00 *** 6.0		2	0	_	^	1	_	0.0	4 75	454/1510	4 04	4 40	4 42	4 20	4 75
3 Nas lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 Discussion Discussion 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 13 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 15 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 20 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 22 Did the lab increa															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12. Did conference shelp you carry out field activities 22. Did conference shelp you carry out field activities 28. Did conference shelp you carry out field activities 28. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28. Were pour contacts with the instructor helpful 28. Do 0 0 0 1 0 0 2 4.33 3.07 3.00 4.44 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.75 4.00 4.00 4.75 4.0	-		-	-											
Discussion Discus															
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were gou provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4. Were assigned topics contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contr															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 2 were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 0 1 0 3 4 12 4.30 778/1391 3.80 4.30 4.35 4.30 3.80 2.00 4.00 4.35 4.30 3.00 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30	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
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 2 were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 0 1 0 3 4 12 4.30 778/1391 3.80 4.30 4.35 4.30 3.80 2.00 4.00 4.35 4.30 3.00 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30	Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 1 0 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 0 3 5 12 4.45 702/1388 3.75 4.42 4.28 4.34 4.45 4. Were special techniques successful 11 0 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 0 0 0 1 8 0 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 0 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 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 1 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 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 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 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 28 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 82 **** 4.68 4.52 4.59 ****		11	0	2	2	1	8	7	3.80	929/1398	3.45	4.08	4.07	4.13	3.80
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 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 21 1 0 0 1 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 1 4 4 4.33 115/240 4.33 3.49 4.11 4.08 4.33 3.49 4.11 4.08 4.33 3.49 4.11 4.08 4.33 4.10 4.06 4.44 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10															
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2. Were provided with adequate background information 2. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2. O 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 115/ 240 4.33 3.49 4.11 4.06 4.44 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2. O 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 2. O 0 0 1 0 3 5 4.33 866 198 4.33 3.92 4.14 4.44 4.78 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 2. Bid o 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.68 4.52 4.59 **** **** **** **** **** **** ****					0	3	5								
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. 1 1 0 0 1 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 2. 2 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 2. 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.78 60/219 4.78 3.93 4.44 4.44 4.78 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2. 2 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 2. 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 89/215 4.56 4.28 4.35 4.21 4.56 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. 2 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 **** 85 **** 4.77 4.58 4.50 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2. 8 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 82 **** 4.68 4.52 4.59 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 2. 8 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.50 **** 80 **** 4.42 4.47 4.66 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 2. 8 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.50 **** 80 **** 4.42 4.47 4.66 **** 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 **** 52 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 2. 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 53 **** 4.04 4.78 **** 3. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 2. 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 4.22 **** 4.04 4.78 **** 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 4.23 **** 4.55 4.52 **** 3. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2. Did study questions ma						4	1			. ,					
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 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 1 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 0 3 5 4.33 86/ 198 4.33 3.99 4.18 4.04 4.78 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 22 0 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 1 2 7 4.78 60/219 4.78 3.93 4.44 4.44 4.78 4.56 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 22 0 0 0 1 0 3 5 4.33 86/198 4.33 3.92 4.18 4.04 4.33	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 22 0 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 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 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 0 2 5.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.68 4.52 4.59 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ***/ 78 **** 3.75 4.47 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 28 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 52 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 53 **** 4.54 4.55 4.51 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 28 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 **** 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 4.30 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** 4.56 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 28 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.57 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 28 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.37 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 28 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.37 5.00 ****	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
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 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 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.77 4.58 4.59 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 1 0 0 1 4.00 ****/ 78 **** 3.75 4.47 4.60 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** Field Work 1. Did greearly understand your evaluation criteria 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 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 53 **** *** 4.04 4.78 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.05 4.31 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 5.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.55 4.63 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.55 5.00 **** 28 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 50 **** *** 4.55 5.00 **** 29 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 50 **** *** 4.55 5.00 **** 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	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
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 1 0 0 1 4.00 ****/ 78 **** 3.75 4.47 4.66 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 1 0 1 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 1 0 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 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 **** **** 4.75 4.63 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 1 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.55 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.55 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 28 0 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 ****	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
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	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
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 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 4.66 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 3.50 **** 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.67 **** 5. Was the instructor available for consultation 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 4.58 4.52 **** 4.58 4.52 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 50 **** 4.55 5.00 **** 4.56 4.30 **** 4.56 5.00 **** 4.56 5.00 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 50 **** 4.55 5.00 **** 4.56 5.00 ***** 4.56 5.00 **** 4.56 5.	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
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 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 4.66 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 3.50 **** 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.67 **** 5. Was the instructor available for consultation 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 4.58 4.52 **** 4.58 4.52 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 50 **** 4.55 5.00 **** 4.56 4.30 **** 4.56 5.00 **** 4.56 5.00 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 50 **** 4.55 5.00 **** 4.56 5.00 ***** 4.56 5.00 **** 4.56 5.	Cominan														
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 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 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 ****/ 42 **** **** 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 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 1 0 0 0 2 4.33 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.45 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 28 0 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 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 ****		27	2	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	1	4 50	****/ 05	****	1 77	1 50	4 50	****
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 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 **** 42 **** **** 4.58 4.52 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 1 0 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 **** 43 **** 4.45 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 28 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 43 **** **** 4.51 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 28 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 **** 43 **** **** 4.37 5.00 ****	-														
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 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 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 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 **** / 32 **** **** 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 ****							-	_		,					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 **** 52 **** 4.08 4.16 4.08 **** 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 0 3 5.00 **** 37 **** **** 4.58 4.52 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 1 0 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 0 3 5.00 **** 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 ****															
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 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 ****	-						-	_		,					
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 0 2 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** 28 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** 29 1 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.45 5.00 **** 20 2 4.33 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.45 5.00 **** 21 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.51 5.00 **** 23 3 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 28 0 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 ****	J. Were criteria for grading made crear	20	_	U	U	U	1	_	1.50	/ 02		1.00	4.10	1.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	Field Work														
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 3 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 ****	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	***
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 ****	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
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 ****	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75		****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 **** 32 **** **** 4.56 4.30 **** 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 **** 4.51 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 28 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 **** 4.37 5.00 ****		28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
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 ****		28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
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 ****															
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 ****			_	_	_	_	_	_							
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 3 5.00 **** 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 ****															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 28 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 5.00 ****								_		, -					
										,					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students $28 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 3 \ 5.00 **** / 21 **** **** 4.52 5.00 \ ****$						-	-	_		, 32					
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 125
Questionnaires: 76

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 1400 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructo: Rai	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Genera																	
		w insights,ski			2	0	3	3	10	22	36		1016/		4.44		4.27	4.28	4.15
		tor make clear			2	0	4	8	11	28	23		1338/		4.26	4.22	4.22	4.20	3.78
		estions reflec			3	1	3	6	16	23	24		1144/		4.19	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.82
		ations reflect			4	21	7	8	8	13	15		1444/		4.04	4.19	4.19	4.24	3.41
	_	_		what you learned	3	2	5	4	12	20	30		883/		4.34	4.09	4.01	4.05	3.93
		_		o what you learned	3	2	18	10	18	10	15		1433/		3.67	4.02	4.05	4.12	2.92
		system clearl		ined	4	1	0	1	5	16	49	4.59	398/	1612	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.12	4.59
8. How ma	any times w	was class cand	elled		4	1	0	0	0	3	68	4.96	331/	1635	4.98	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.96
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	2	2	21	27	20	3.85	1102/	1579	4.15	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.85
		Lectur	_																
		ctor's lecture			4	0	2	3	10	24	33		1169/		4.58	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.15
2. Did th	ne instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	4	0	1	2	3	10	56	4.64	1074/	1520	4.71	4.72	4.70	4.68	4.64
				xplained clearly	4	0	3	6	12	31	20	3.82	1235/	1517	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.23	3.82
4. Did th	ne lecture:	s contribute t	o 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 au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	10	6	4	18	22	14	3.53	963/	1295	4.05	4.11	3.94	3.95	3.53
		Discus	sion																
				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 a	all student	ts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instruct	tor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	special te	chniques succe	ssful		35	33	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/	958	****	4.11	3.93	3.97	****
		Labora	itory																
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	75	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	240	****	3.49	4.11	4.08	****
		Field																	
				hat you learned	75	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	75	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
		Self																	
1. Did se	elf-paced s	system contrib	oute to	what you learned	75	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re	ason	s				Тур	oe .			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 26		Re	quır	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	r	48
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 26		_		-								_			
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	14	C 15		Ge	nera	Τ.				2	Und	er-gr	ad 7	6	Non-	major	28
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	21	D 0								-			_				•
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		EΙ	ecti	ves				1			Means t			_	n
				P 0		0.	1				_		res	ponse	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	ΙT	
				I 0		Οt	her				6	13							
				? 1															

Course-Section: PSYC 335 8020 University of Maryland Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		1				ructor	Course De Mean Me								
Questions	NI	3.	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cours	se 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			0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	273/1639		4.22	4.22	4.20	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goal		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)	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 lea			1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	178/1532		4.09	4.01	4.05	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you 1			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	13	1	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 effecti	iveness 12	2	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	ct 13	1	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 cle	early 12	2	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	13	1	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 understa	anding 11	1	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 lea	arned 14	4	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 partici	ipate 14	4	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 discu	ussion 14	4	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	4	7	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.11	3.93	3.97	****
	Frequenc	су	Dist	ribu	tior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	Grades	s Reasons						Туј	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A	7		Req	uire	d fo	or Ma	jor	`s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	13
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B	2		-	_			-								
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C	3		Gen	eral					3	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	12
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D	1									_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F	0		Ele	ctiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
Р	0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I	0		Oth	ıer					8	_					
?	0														

Page 1401

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101 SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN Fall 2007 Page 1402

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires:	78 38	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
		Frequencies

Title

		2.2			Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		1138/1397		4.25	4.28		3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	22	0	2	1	5	5		1010/1583	4.00	4.19	4.19		4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	3	4	25	4.53			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	,			4.16		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
T a silveria														
Lecture	_	0	0	-	_	_	0.0	4 25	000/1510	4 45	4 40	4 40	4 20	4 20
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	Ţ	2	7	23	4.37	,			4.43		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	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	Ţ	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	,	4.21		4.22		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	,	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		3.64
- -														
Enorm		Diat	i h	1 + i 01	_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	38	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 340 8020 SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY ARTEAGA, SHIRLE

> P 0

I 0

?

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

20

University of Maryland Page 1403 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questions						-	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	-		Level			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	860/1639	4.33	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.29
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	831/1639	4.17	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.29
		estions reflec			0	0	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1228/1397	3.74	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.64
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.19	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did a	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute 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 w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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 t	he grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	2	0	0	3	9	4.21	860/1612	4.41	4.28	4.16	4.12	4.21
8. How m	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.69	4.71	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How w	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1133/1579	3.76	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.80
		Lectur	<u> </u>															
1 Were	the instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	720/1518	4.47	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.57
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	5	8		1188/1520	4.69	4.72	4.70	4.68	4.50
				explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	779/1517	4.35	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.36
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	927/1550	4.21	4.35	4.22	4.20	4.21
				our understanding	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	768/1295	3.97	4.11	3.94	3.95	3.86
		Discus	aion															
1 Did a	alaga diga			what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	660/1398	4.19	4.08	4.07	4.13	4.21
				ed to participate	0	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	736/1391	4.19	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.36
		_	_	nd open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	521/1388	4.62	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.64
		chniques succe		a open arbeassion	0	4	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	380/ 958		4.11	3.93	3.97	4.20
				Frequ	encs	niet	tri hı	ıtioı	า									
				11040	iciicy	DIS	CIID	20101	-									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	s Reasons							Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors					 s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r r	7	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	-									_				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General				1	Under-grad 14			Non-	major	7			
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0							_							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives					0	#### - Means there			are not enough		jh		

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101 Page 1404 PSYCH OF AGGRESSION FEB 13, 2008 SCHULTZ, DAVID Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

I 0

? 0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

83

					Frequencies			Inst	structor Course Dept		Dept	t UMBC Level		Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	754/1639	4.56	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.41
		ctor make clear			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 q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected 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 eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected 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 r	eadings contrib	ute 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 as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	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 canc	elled		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 overa	ll tead	hing 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	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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	as lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	486/1517	4.68	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.59
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	o 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	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	221/1295	4.37	4.11	3.94	3.95	4.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute 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	e all stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d 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	e special t	echniques succe	ssful		8	4	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	349/ 958	4.13	4.11	3.93	3.97	4.25
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	1									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons					Туре				Majors	}			
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required fo			 or M			2	 Graduat		0	Majo		24	
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	B 14		Red	1ull (eu I)⊥ IVI	a JOI	D	4	Graduat	E	U	Majc	JΤ	24
56-83		2.00-2.99	5	C 1		Cer	nera	1				4	Under-q	rad 2	0.0	Non-	-major	4
84-150		3.00-3.49	5	D 0	General 4			•	Under-grad 28			14011		1				
Grad.	0 0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives				0	#### - Means there		here a	re not	enous	rh			
01001	ŭ	3.33 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,==.

Other

15

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

				Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	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
	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
	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
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	7	3	9		1331/1583	4.03	4.19	4.19	4.24	3.65
	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
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	2	5		3.96	884/1504	4.17	4.02	4.05	4.12	3.96
	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	5	1	4	3			1445/1612	3.88	4.28	4.16	4.12	3.38
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	19	4		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
	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
	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
	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
	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														
	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
	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
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	224/1388	4.93		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	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 240	****	3.49	4.11	4.08	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 219	****	3.49	4.44	4.44	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.21	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 198	****		4.18	4.04	****
٥.	were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	23	_	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	O	3.00	/ 100		3.72	1.10	1.01	
	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	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.75	4.47	4.60	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 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	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
	1		_	-	-	-	-	_		, 3.					
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
	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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 345 0101 University of Maryland Page 1406
Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 45

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questionnaires: 28

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00 5

Ρ

I

0

0

1

							Fr	equer	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	617/1639	4.37	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.44
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	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 ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	21	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1583	4.40	4.19	4.19	4.24	***
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contribu	ite 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 wr	itten as	signments contri	bute t	to what you learned	1	22	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1504	****	4.02	4.05	4.12	***
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	1	0	0	1	2	9	15	4.41	632/1612	4.35	4.28	4.16	4.12	4.41
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	1056/1635	4.81	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.62
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teac	ching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	14	7	4.04	865/1579	3.90	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.04
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s 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 th	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n 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 le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	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 th	e lectur	es 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 au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	3	1	1	1	4	10	8	3.96	677/1295	3.96	4.11	3.94	3.95	3.96
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite 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 a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	ed 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage f	air an	nd 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 s	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful		6	19	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 958	3.83	4.11	3.93	3.97	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	17
28-55 56-83	1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 4	B 12 C 5		0	nera	1				7	IIndox	~~d ^	8	Morr	mo i o	11
84-150	4 6	3.00-2.99	5	D 0		Ge	nera	L				/	Under-g	rau 2	0	MOI1-	-major	11
04-150	Ö	3.00-3.49	5	ט ע														

Electives

15

Other

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 345 8020 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI

University of Maryland Page 1407 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15			
Questionnaires:	14	Student Cou	urse Evaluation	Questionnaire

								Fr	eane:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		_		Mean	
			General	 I															
1 т	nid voi	ı dəin n	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	7	0	0	0	Λ	3	4	4.57	540/1639	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.57
			ctor make clear			7	0	0	0	1	3	3		831/1639		4.22	4.22	4.20	4.29
			uestions reflect			7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	897/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.14
		_	uations reflect		_	7	2	0	0	0	3	2		597/1583		4.19	4.19	4.24	4.40
					what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	_	4.00	774/1532		4.09	4.01	4.05	4.00
					o what you learned	7	4	0	0	0	1			****/1504		4.02	4.05	4.12	****
			g system clearly		_	7	0	0	0	2	1		4.29	779/1612		4.28	4.16	4.12	4.29
			was class cance			7	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1635		4.71	4.65	4.66	5.00
					hing effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1170/1579		4.05	4.08		3.75
			Lecture																
1 τ	Wara th	nrenared	Ω	0	0	0	1	3	2	4 17	1162/1518	4.40	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.17			
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					Ω	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520		4.72	4.70	4.68	4.83
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517		4.35	4.27	4.23	4.67
			es contribute to		-	8	0	0	0	0	4	_	4.33	832/1550		4.35	4.22	4.20	4.33
					our understanding	7		0	1	0	0			****/1295		4.11		3.95	****
			Discuss			_	•	•	•	•	-	_	1 06	100/1200	4 5 6	4 00	4 00	4 10	1 06
					what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398		4.08	4.07	4.13	4.86
					d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3		4.57	,		4.36	4.30		4.57
					d open discussion	7 7	0 1	1	0	0	3 3		4.57			4.42	4.28		4.57
4. V	were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssiui		/	Τ	Τ	U	U	3	2	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	4.11	3.93	3.97	3.83
			Self I	Paced															
3. V	Were yo	our conta	acts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
					Freq	ienas	, Dia	trib	u+ i o:	n									
					1104	acticy	DIS	CIID	acio.										
Cred	dits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5		
00-	 -27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	 3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	7
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		_				J						5 -		
	-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	L4	Non-	-major	7
84-	-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
	_	_		_			_						_						

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

Course-Section: PSYC 357 0101 PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN Baltimore County O'BRIEN, EILEEN

> ? 1

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 33

40

University of Maryland Page 1408 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Fivaluation	Ouestionnaire	4

							Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	1	3	11	16	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.25
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	6	12	13	4.16	959/1639	4.16	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.16
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	5	12	14	4.22	831/1397	4.22	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.22
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	0	2	4	11	14	4.19	852/1583	4.19	4.19	4.19	4.24	4.19
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	0	1	7	7	15	4.20	882/1612	4.20	4.28	4.16	4.12	4.20
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	11	20	4.65	1023/1635	4.65	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.65
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	1	2	5	16	4	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.71
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	d 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 le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	535/1517	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.55
4. Did th	as lecture material presented and explained clear: id 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 au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	1	1	1	2	10	13	4.22	481/1295	4.22	4.11	3.94	3.95	4.22
		Discus																
				what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.08	4.07	4.13	4.50
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.80
		_		d open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	387/1388		4.42	4.28	4.34	4.75
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		13	5	3	0	3	4	5	3.53	712/ 958	3.53	4.11	3.93	3.97	3.53
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 16		Red	 quir		 or M	 Ia ior		3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9			-1 ~ -1 .			,	_	-	or adda	-	-		-	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 3	3	Non-	-major	18
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D 0		001		_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				4	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enouc	rh
	-	2.23 2.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		O+1	her				1	.1			9-		-	
				- 0		001					_	-						

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI

RABIN, BERNARD

Instructor:

Enrollment: 75 Questionnaires: 32

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1409

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	2	0	_	0	11	_	0	2 55	1475/1620	2 55	4 00	4 07	4 00	2 55
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2 1	2	11 12	9	5		1475/1639 1477/1639	3.55 3.52	4.29 4.22	4.27 4.22	4.28 4.20	3.55 3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	2	10	7	7		1262/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	6	6	7	2	5		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		****/1504		4.02	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	5	6	14	4.07		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		4.71	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		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		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		1391/1391	1.85	4.36	4.30		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		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 53		****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	L	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 370 0101 University of Maryland Title FEB 13, 2008

SENSATION AND PERCEPTI Baltimore County Fall 2007 PROVINE, ROBERT

Instructor: Enrollment: 121 Questionnaires: 114

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1410

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	es		Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	46	0	2	4	14	17	31	4.04 1110/163	9 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 1388/163	9 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 1155/139	7 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 1410/158	3 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 1092/153	2 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 1388/150	4 3.11	4.02	4.05	4.12	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	47	0	1	2	3	16	45	4.52 469/161	2 4.52	4.28	4.16	4.12	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	47	0	0	0	0	1	66	4.99 133/163	5 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 1239/157	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 1261/151	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	4.71 979/152	0 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 1339/151	7 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	4.16 972/155	0 4.16	4.35	4.22	4.20	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	46	1	1	4	11	16	35	4.19 505/129	5 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 1201/139	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 1200/139		4.36	4.30		3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	2	7	13	10	14	3.59 1162/138	3.59	4.42	4.28	4.34	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	66	36	3	1	3	2	3	3.08 ****/ 95	8 ****	4.11	3.93	3.97	****
Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trik	outic	n								
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs		T	уре			Majors	\$

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed 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	В	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	50	-			
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 1411

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 66 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101

67

PERSONALITY

RESTA, PETER

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1 Did voi	ı dain new	insights,ski		this course	34	0	0	0	7	5	20	4.41	754/1639	4 41	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.41
		or make clear			35	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	404/1639	4.61	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.61
		stions reflect			34	0	0	1	0	6	25	4.72	323/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.72
	_	tions reflect			36	2	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	524/1583		4.19	4.19	4.24	4.46
				what you learned	35	2	2	1	3	7	16	4.17	648/1532		4.09	4.01	4.05	4.17
				what you learned	35	2	0	0	6	10	13	4.24	620/1504		4.02	4.05	4.12	4.24
		system clearly			34	0	0	1	1	2	28	4.78	186/1612		4.28	4.16	4.12	4.78
		as class cance	_		35	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	662/1635		4.71	4.65	4.66	4.90
	-			ning effectiveness	40	1	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	234/1579		4.05	4.08	4.07	4.68
J. 110	,	440 0110 07014	00001	ing crreotiveness	10	-	Ü	Ü	_	Ü		1.00	201, 10, ,	1.00	1.05	1.00	1.0,	1.00
11		Lecture		,	2.6	0	0	0	-	0	0.5	4 00	001/1510	4 00	4 40	4 42	4 20	4 05
		tor's lectures			36	0	0	0	Ţ	2	27	4.87	271/1518		4.49	4.43	4.39	4.87
		or seem inter			36	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	219/1520	4.97	4.72	4.70	4.68	4.97
				xplained clearly	36	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	287/1517	4.77	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.77
		contribute to	-		36	1	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	185/1550	4.90	4.35	4.22	4.20	4.90
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	36	6	1	1	2	10	10	4.13	561/1295	4.13	4.11	3.94	3.95	4.13
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	ite to v	what you learned	53	0	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	****/1398	****	4.08	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were a	ll student	s actively end	couraged	d to participate	53	0	2	1	0	2	8	4.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair and	d open discussion	53	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were sp	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful		53	7	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/ 958	****	4.11	3.93	3.97	****
		Labora	orv															
4. Did the	e lab inst	ructor provide	-	ance	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.21	****
		-		early specified	65	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 198	****	3.92	4.18	4.04	***
	-	_																
				Frequ	lency	Dis	tribu	utior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 19		Red	 quire	ed fo	or M	aior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3							-		5_ 5.5.5.00	-	-) ~		-
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C 1		Gei	nera	L				6	Under-g	rad 6	6	Non-	major	66
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.7						
				- 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101 University of Maryland Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1412

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

DAHLQUIST, LYNN Enrollment: 48 Questionnaires: 31 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	26	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.80
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.67
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	302/1397		4.25	4.28	4.26	4.73
	_	uations reflect		_	1	1	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	239/1583	4.76	4.19	4.19	4.24	4.76
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.28	4.16	4.12	4.80
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	14	16	4.53	1114/1635	4.53	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.53
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	248/1579	4.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.65
		Lectur	_															
1 Were t	he instr	Lectur actor's lecture		orenared	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	149/1518	4.93	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.93
			1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.68	5.00		
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clea					0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	63/1517	4.97	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.97
	as lecture material presented and explained clea id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	70/1550	4.97	4.35	4.22	4.20	4.97
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	185/1295			3.94		4.67
J. Dia aa	arovibaa.	r cccimitqueb en	nance j	Jar anacrocanarny	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	O	21	1.07	103/12/3	1.07		3.71	3.75	1.07
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		13	12	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 958	****	4.11	3.93	3.97	****
				E		- D												
				Frequ	iency	DIST	tribu	11101	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	рe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 12			-			,								
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Ger	neral	L				6	Under-g	rad 3	31	Non-	major	7
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh
				P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				2	12						
				? 1														

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0201 University of Maryland HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY ANDERSON, ROBER

0

2

I

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1413

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	ANDERSON,	ROBER	Fall 2007	
Enrollment:	52			
Questionnaires:	40		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

Title

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	. 1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	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 learne	ed 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 lear	ned 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 effectiven	ess 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 clearl	y 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 understandi	.ng 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 learne	ed 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 participat	e 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 discussi	on 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	****
F	'requenc	y Di	strib	ution	n									
	,			_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	.des	les Reasons							Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 18	Required for Majors 3						3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	20	
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 7														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 8 C 2		General 8					8	Under-g	rad 4	0	Non-	major	20	
84-150 16 3.00-3.49 6 D 0										_				
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 P 0		Electives 2 #### - Means there are not eresponses to be significant					_	ıh						

Other

16

University of Maryland NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG Baltimore County

Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 26

Title

Fall 2007

Page 1414 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
~~~~~														
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					_	_			/4-40	4 50				
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1				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		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		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		1000/1550	4.14				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		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		1307/1388	3.10	4.42	4.28	4.34	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	0.5	0	0	_	0	•	-	F 00	05	ale ale ale ale	4 55	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 78	****	3.75	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.42	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	U	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		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
o. Dia conferences help jou carry out richa accivitates		ŭ	Ū	Ü	Ū	Ü	_	3.00	, 32			1.50	1.50	
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	****

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 393X 8020

23

HUMAN SEXUALITY

ANDERSON, ROBER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Fall 2007

Page 1415

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

					Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı dain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1639	4.91	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.91
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	735/1639	4.36	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.36
		uestions reflect			1	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	795/1397	4.25	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.25
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	771/1583	4.27	4.19	4.19	4.24	4.27
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	562/1532		4.09	4.01	4.05	4.27
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27		4.27	4.02	4.05	4.12	4.27
		g system clearly		-	1	1	3	0	3	0	4	3.20	1488/1612	3.20	4.28	4.16	4.12	3.20
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1265/1635	4.36	4.71	4.65	4.66	4.36
			the overall teaching effectivenes		1	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	737/1579	4.18	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.18
1 Were t	he instri	Lecture actor's lecture:		orenared	1	0	0	1	1	4	5	<i>Δ</i> 1Ω	1148/1518	4.18	4.49	4.43	4.39	4.18
					1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	776/1520	4.82	4.72	4.70	4.68	4.82
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	1	4	6	4.45	661/1517		4.35	4.27	4.23	4.45
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	6	5	4.45	703/1550	4.45	4.35	4.22	4.20	4.45
	•	1	0 1	0 1	0	1	2	6	4.20	505/1295	4.20	4.11			4.20			
J. Dia ac	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						-	O	_	_	Ü	1.20	303/12/3	1.20		3.71	3.75	1.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively end	courage	d 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 th	ne instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d 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 s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.11	3.93	3.97	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						J						5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				5	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0	respons				respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt					
				I 0		Otl	ner					2						
				? 1														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 22 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	0		
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	9

Course-Section: PSYC 399 0130

Coop Educ in Psych

Rohrbach, Alison

Title

Instructor:

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept		Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	=	this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.75
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	5.00
		estions reflect	_	_	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	182/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.88
	_	ations reflect			4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	5.00
				what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	4.75
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	182/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.75
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	expla:	ned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.88
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	you grade the overall teaching effectives				0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	312/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.57
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures		prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.86
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	4.86
		plained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.86		
		es contribute to			5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.71
			_	our understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1295	***	4.31	3.94	3.84	5.00
		Discus																
ו הנת ו				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	5.00
				nat you learned to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	5 5	5.00	1/1396	****	4.60	4.07	4.07	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	****	4.53	4.28	4.07	5.00
		echniques succes		open discussion	7 7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	****	4.39	3.93		4.75
4. Wele s	special te	ecinitques succei	ssiui		,	_	U	U	U	_	3	4.75	119/ 930		4.35	3.93	3.71	4.75
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	auir		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1,00	7u11	Ju I	J_ 1'10	، ۲۰۰۰	_		Graduat	_	J	1.10.10	/ <u>_</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Comorar							-	011001 9		_	2.011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives						1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh	
	-			P 0	Electives					respons				_	•			
				I O		Ot1	her					2			5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 406 0101 University of Maryland
Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY Baltimore County

ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY Baltimore County MURPHY, CHRISTO Fall 2007

Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1416

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	-				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	1						

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

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17

FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1417

			Fre	-	ncies	5			ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	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		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	
or sin dualovisual commiques emanee your andersounding	-	_	_	_	_	Ü	Ü	1.10	313, 1233	1.10		3.71	1.01	1110
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		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16 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	****

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	0						

#### Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101 University of Maryland FEB 13, 2008

Page 1418

Job IRBR3029

Title DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT Baltimore County Instructor: SONNENSCHEIN, S Fall 2007

Enrollment: 20

Ouestionnaires:	2.0	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnaries.	20	Deadcire	COULDC	DValaacion	Queberonnarie

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Question	s		N	R	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Genera	1																
nı gain ne		_	this course		5	0	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1371/1639	3.73	4.29	4.27	4.42	3.73
						0	1	2	3	5	4			3.60			4.29	3.60
					5	0	0	0	4	5	6		,	4.13			4.38	4.13
_			_			0	1	3	1	4	6							3.73
		_	_			0	1	-		5	4		-,					3.60
						0	0			4	5		- ,					3.67
	_		-			0	1	4	2	5	3		. ,		4.28	4.16	4.18	3.33
						0	0	0	0	5	10		,			4.65	4.72	4.67
-			ing effectiven	ess	8	0	2	1	3	6	0	3.08	1465/1579	3.08	4.05	4.08	4.21	3.08
-			3															
	Lectur	е																
he instru	uctor's lecture	s well p	repared		5	0	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	1293/1518	3.93	4.49	4.43	4.51	3.93
ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject		6	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	1136/1520	4.57	4.72	4.70	4.75	4.57
ecture mat	terial presente	d and ex	plained clearl	У	5	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1268/1517	3.73	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.73
ne lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned		5	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1297/1550	3.60	4.35	4.22	4.24	3.60
diovisua	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understandi	.ng	6	1	1	4	5	2	1	2.85	1207/1295	2.85	4.11	3.94	4.01	2.85
	Discus	gion																
ass disc			hat vou learne	·d 1	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1002/1398	3.70	4.08	4.07	4.23	3.70
			-			-	-	1	4	2	3							3.70
	_	_				-					2		,					3.10
	_					6	1	2	0	0	1		,				4.24	****
	_																	
			F	'requen	су	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	ides				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
 1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4			 Rec	านา่า	 ed f	or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	0	Maic	 or	12
0			== =			100	1411	JA I	O1 11C		~	•	Gradac	_	•	11000		
1						Ger	nera	1				2	Under-a	rad 2	2.0	Non-	-maior	8
_			D 0			001		_				_	011001 9	2		1.011		J
		-	- •									0						,
0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0			$El\epsilon$	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	ıre not	: enouc	an
· ·	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0			Ele	ectiv	ves				U					t enoug nt	gn
· ·	3.50-4.00	3				Ele Oth		ves			1	.2	#### - respons				_	gn
	ne instruction exam quicher evalusigned resisted assigned resisted resisted assigned resisted	Genera  Du gain new insights, ski  De instructor make clear  De exam questions reflect  Seigned readings contribute  Discustions reflect  Seigned readings contribute  Discustions reflect  Commodities was class cance  Discustions contribute to the contribute of the contribute to the	ne instructor make clear the explice exam questions reflect the explications reflect the explications reflect the explications reflect the explications resided the explications resided to the grading system clearly explaintly times was class cancelled build you grade the overall teach of the instructor's lectures well place instructor seem interested in ecture material presented and explications and techniques enhance you contribute to what you diovisual techniques enhance you can be seed to be instructor encourage fair and explications and instructor encourage fair and explications are contributed to what you can be instructed and explications are discussions contributed to we have a seed to the contribute to what is students actively encouraged are instructor encourage fair and expecial techniques successful  The contribute to what you can be instructed and contribute to what is a successful the contribute to what you can be instructed and contribute	General  Ou gain new insights, skills from this course he instructor make clear the expected goals he exam questions reflect the expected goals sher evaluations reflect the expected goals shere evaluations reflect the expected goals shere evaluations reflect the expected goals white the subject have grading system clearly explained any times was class cancelled he instructor's lectures well prepared he instructor seem interested in the subject for extremal presented and explained clearly he lectures contribute to what you learned additional techniques enhance your understanding the instructor encourage fair and open discussion has discussions contribute to what you learned he instructor encourage fair and open discussion appecial techniques successful  Figure 4 Cum. GPA Expected Gradund Cum. GPA Expected Grad	General  Ou gain new insights, skills from this course  The instructor make clear the expected goals  The exam questions reflect the expected goals  The exam questions contribute to what you learned  The property of the exam questions of the exam questions of the exam questions of the exam questions  The exam questions reflect the expected Grades  The property of the exam questions of the exam question of the expected Grades  The exam questions reflect the expected Grades of the exam question of the	General  Ou gain new insights, skills from this course  is instructor make clear the expected goals  is exam questions reflect the expected goals  is signed readings contribute to what you learned  is grading system clearly explained  in grading system clearly expected grades  in grading system clearly explained  in grading s	General  Ou gain new insights, skills from this course  De instructor make clear the expected goals  De exam questions reflect the expected goals  De exam questions reflect the expected goals  Designed readings contribute to what you learned  Designed readings contribute to what you learned  Designed reading system clearly explained  Designed you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  Designed you learned  Designed you grade the overall prepared  Designed you learned  Designed you grade the expected you grade you learned  Designed you grade the overall prepared  Designed you grade the overall prepared  Designed you grade the you learned  Designed you grade the you grade you learned  Designed you grade the you grade you	Questions NR NA 1  General  Ou gain new insights, skills from this course 5 0 1  Due instructor make clear the expected goals 5 0 1  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1  Due goaldings contribute to what you learned 5 0 1  Due goalding system clearly explained 5 0 1  Due de instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0  Due instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0  Due contribute to what you learned 5 0 2  Discussion  Discussi	Questions	Questions   NR NA 1 2 3	General  Ou gain new insights, skills from this course 5 0 1 2 1 7  Due instructor make clear the expected goals 5 0 1 2 3 5  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 0 0 4 5  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 3 1 4  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 3 1 4  Due exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 1 3 1 4  Due grading contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 2 3 5  Due grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 4 2 4  Due grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 4 2 4  Due grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 0 0 5  Due ture was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 5  Due ture an instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 2 2 6  Due instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 2 2 6  Due instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 1 0 3  Discussion 2 2 2 3  Discussion 2 2 2 3  Discussion 2 2 2 3  Addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 1 1 4 5 2  Discussion 2 2 2 3  Discussion 3 4 4 5 2  Discussion 2 2 2 3  Discussion 2 2 2 3  Discussion 3 4 4 5 2  Discussion 3 4 4 5 2  Discussion 3 4 4 6 8  Discussion 4 7 8  Discussion 6 7 8 8  Discussion 7 9 7 8 8 4  Discussion 7 9 7 8 8 4  Discussion 8 9 8 9  Discussion 8 9 9 9 8 9  Discussion 9 9 9 8 9  Discussion 9 9 9 8 9  Discussion 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9  Discussion 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	Questions   NR NA 1 2 3 4 5	Questions	Questions	Questions	Questions	Questions	Questions

Course-Section: PSYC 437 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1419 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

MAKING A DIFFERENCE Instructor: MATON, KENNETH Fall 2007

Enrollment: 13 Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 5 4.22 919/1639 4.22 4.29 4.27 4.42 4.22 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 774/1639 4.33 4.22 4.22 4.29 4.33 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1397 **** 4.25 4.28 4.38 **** 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 0 3 6 4.67 245/1504 4.67 4.02 4.05 4.20 4.67 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled 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 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 Ω 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 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 7 4.56 397/1398 4.56 4.08 4.07 4.23 4.56 248/1391 4.89 4.36 4.30 4.48 4.89 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 8 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 2 1 2 2 3.57 694/958 3.57 4.11 3.93 4.24 3.57 Seminar 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.77 4.58 4.83 **** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.68 4.52 4.49 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  $8 \quad 0 \quad 0$ Ω 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 78 **** 3.75 4.47 4.56 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 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 1 5.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.08 4.16 4.02 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.84 **** 1 5.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.58 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 42 **** **** 4.75 4.71 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 Ω 0 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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** **** 4.45 4.85 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 8 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.51 4.00 **** 0 0 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 43 **** **** 4.69 4.85 **** 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.37 4.67 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.52 4.50 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	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	В	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	i

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 3

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
01														
General	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4 50	615/1639	4 50	4 20	4 07	4 40	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		•	0	Τ	U	2	,	4.50	199/1639	4.50 4.80	4.29	4.27 4.22	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0 5	0	0	0	0	8	4.80	1/1397			4.22	4.29	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	5.00	299/1583	5.00 4.70	4.25 4.19	4.28	4.38 4.31	5.00 4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.70	299/1583		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 4.70	222/1504	4.70 4.70	4.09	4.01	4.07	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.02	4.05	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	-	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.18	5.00
•	0	0	0	0	0	3	7		220/1579	4.70	4.71	4.05		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	3	/	4.70	220/15/9	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
1									, ,					
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		****/ 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	****

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101 University of Maryland Page 1421
Title SOCIAL/HEALTH Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 22

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

								Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera																
1	D:4		Genera w insights,ski	_	m this source	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.44	712/1639	4.44	4.29	4.27	4.42	4.44
	_	_	ctor make clear			6	0	0	1	4	4	7		1044/1639	4.44	4.29	4.27	4.42	4.44
			estions reflec			6	14	0	0	0	1	1		****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.38	****
		_	ations reflect		_	6	14	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.19	4.19	4.31	4.75
					what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.75	223/1532	4.75	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.75
		_	_		o what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	230/1504	4.69	4.09	4.01	4.07	4.69
			g system clearly			6	1	0	4	3	4	4		1387/1612		4.02	4.16	4.18	3.53
			was class canc		Inea	6	0	0	0	8	8	0		1603/1635	3.50	4.71	4.65	4.72	3.50
		-			hing effectiveness	7	1	0	1	2	4	7		702/1579			4.08		4.21
9.	HOW WOL	ara you g	grade the overa	II Leac	ning effectiveness	/		U	Τ	2	4	/	4.21	/02/15/9	4.21	4.05	4.00	4.21	4.21
			Lectur	۵															
1.	Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	_	prepared	6	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	1094/1518	4.25	4.49	4.43	4.51	4.25
			ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.72	4.70	4.75	4.88
					xplained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	822/1517	4.31	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.31
			es contribute to			6	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	435/1550	4.69	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.69
					our understanding	6	3	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.11	3.94	4.01	4.00
٥.	Dia da	410115441	. ocomingaco cin	ilailee j	our underseamaring	ŭ	J	ŭ	-		-		1.00	023,1233	1.00		3.71	1.01	1.00
			Discus	sion															
1.	Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studen	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	7	1	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	296/ 958	4.36	4.11	3.93	4.24	4.36
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Cre	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	ne.			Majors	
0.0	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	12
28	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56	-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 2	2	Non-	major	10
	-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Gr	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
					P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Otl	ner				1	1						

? 1

Course-Section: PSYC 493B 0101 University of Maryland Page 1422
Title HIV/AIDS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: HUEBNER, DAVID Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 15

Student	Course	Evaluati	ion Ouesti	ionnaire

Questionnaires: 11

					Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/1639	4.91	4.29	4.27	4.42	4.91
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	191/1639	4.82	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.82
		uestions reflec			1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.38	****
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.19	4.19	4.31	4.80
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	160/1612	4.82	4.28	4.16	4.18	4.82
8. How max	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.90	4.71	4.65	4.72	4.90
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.21	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were ti	he instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.49	4.43	4.51	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.75	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	157/1517	4.90	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.90
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	174/1550	4.91	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.91
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	203/1295	4.64	4.11	3.94	4.01	4.64
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	5.00		4.30	4.48	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.50	5.00
		echniques succe			1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	267/ 958		4.11	3.93	4.24	4.40
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	amad	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	asons				т.				Majawa	
	arneu	Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades					ason:	5 			Ту]				Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	βh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					3						

? 0

Course-Section: PSYC 493C 0101 University of Maryland Page 1423
Title ADDICTIONS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15		
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions					NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	248/1639	4.82	4.29	4.27	4.42	4.82
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	476/1639		4.22	4.22	4.29	4.55
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	589/1397	4.45	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.45
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	434/1583	4.55	4.19	4.19	4.31	4.55
				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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.28	4.16	4.18	4.36
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.91	4.71	4.65	4.72	4.91
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	601/1579	4.30	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.30
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1518	4.64	4.49	4.43	4.51	4.64
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.72	4.70	4.75	4.91
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	230/1517	4.82	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.82
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	481/1295	4.22	4.11	3.94	4.01	4.22
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		3	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.11	3.93	4.24	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
																		, 
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	8
28-55												_	_	_	_			
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Gei	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		-						_						
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt	

Other

7

I

?

0

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101 University of Maryland Page 1424
Title INTERVIEWING Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: CARLTON, CHRIST Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.42	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1444/1639	3.60	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.60
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.37	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1484/1583	3.25	4.19	4.19	4.31	3.25
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.71	4.65	4.81	5.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	4.17	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	he instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.72	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.32	4.40
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.35	4.22	4.23	4.20
				our understanding	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.11	3.94	3.95	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.47	5.00
				d 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 s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.11	3.93	4.01	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
								Do	asons	_			Ty				Majors	
credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grac												ту.	 pe			Majors 	
00-27							quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	4	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	5
84-150						_						_						_
Grad.	Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					3						

#### Course-Section: PSYC 601B 0101 University of Maryland Page 1425 Title FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

TOPICS IN SOC. COMM.PS Baltimore County Fall 2007 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH

Enrollment: 4

Ouestionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	N	ΝA	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	ed 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 effectives	ness 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	Ο	0	Ο	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 clear:			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 understand:			3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.11	3.94		5.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	ed 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 participat			0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.22	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:			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		4.75
I	requenc	уľ	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	ades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1			Rea	uire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	1	Graduat	 e	2	 Majo	 r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			- 1				J						5 -		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			Gen	eral	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	4

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4
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	Ĺ
				P	2			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601E 0101 University of Maryland Page 1426
Title CORE I Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: WALDSTEIN SHAP

Title CORE I Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	cies	3		Instr	uctor	Course			Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601F 0101 University of Maryland Title CLIN INTERVENTION III

Baltimore County

Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1427

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	2	4.70	316/1639	4.70	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.70
3. Did the exam guestions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/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		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	2	0	1	0	0	5	2	2 00	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		1318/1520		4.49	4.43	4.49	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	2		1260/1517	3.75	4.72	4.70	4.79	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	0		1428/1550	3.13	4.35	4.27	4.23	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	-,		4.11	3.94	3.95	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	_	U	U	1		-1	4	4.10	511/1295	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	Λ	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		4.68	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
5. Note delicated for grading made offer	_	0	J	J	J	•		3.00	1, 02	3.00	1.00	1.10	1.57	3.00

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 8020 University of Maryland Title PROF HUMAN RES PRACTIC

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 8

Page 1428 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Λ	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		4.13	4.22	4.22		4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	,	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		4.19	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	,	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		4.11			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	,	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		4.75
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		****/ 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		4.08	4.16	4.37	5.00
Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Expected Grades	- 1				agong				Тъл				Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 8020 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO INDUS/ORG PSY

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: ALONSO, SHIRLEY

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Page 1429 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

		Ouestion	a		MD	NA		eque 2	ncies	s 4	Е	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean
		Question 	.S 			NA						Mean	Raiik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1252/1639	3.90	4.29	4.27	4.42	3.90
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.22	4.22	4.26	5.00
	_	estions reflec		_	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.37	****
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	6		371/1583		4.19	4.19	4.31	4.60
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8		146/1532		4.09	4.01	4.10	4.80
				o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5		667/1504		4.02	4.05	4.29	4.20
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	8		166/1612		4.28	4.16	4.27	4.80
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	8		811/1635		4.71	4.65	4.81	
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	312/1579	4.57	4.05	4.08	4.17	4.57
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s 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	e instruc	n 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 le	cture mat	erial presente	xplained 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	e lecture	es contribute t	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 aud	diovisual	our understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	209/1295	4.63	4.11	3.94	3.95	4.63		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	4	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	4.11	3.93	4.01	4.20
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t	copics relevant	to the	announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.77	4.58	4.58	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9 B 0		ке	quir	ea I	or Ma	ajor	ន	U	Graduat	е	4	Majo	)r.	7
	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	В 0 С 0		<i>a</i> -		1				2	TT		_	NT		2
56-83							nera	Τ				2	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	3
84-150	1 130 3 3.00 3.19 1 2											0			,			,
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		EΙ	ecti	ves				0	#### -					ın
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	oe sign	niticar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					7						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 605 0101 U: Title LEARNING AND COGNITION

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Title LEARNING AND C Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1430 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	1	7	4	2	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.29	4.27	4.42	3.50
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	6	5		1044/1639		4.22	4.22	4.26	4.07
		uestions reflec			1	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	906/1397	4.13	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.13
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	0	3	2	8	2	3.60	1367/1583	3.60	4.19	4.19	4.31	3.60
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	9	2	3.87	942/1532	3.87	4.09	4.01	4.10	3.87
				o 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	90/1612	4.93	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.93
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	736/1635	4.86	4.71	4.65	4.81	4.86
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	1	0	0	6	4	1	3.55	1298/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	4.17	3.55
		Lectur																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1141/1518	4.20	4.49	4.43	4.49	4.20	
		n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	10		1033/1520		4.72	4.70	4.79	4.67		
		xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	8	2		1268/1517		4.35	4.27	4.32	3.73		
		you learned	1	0	0	2	3	9			1297/1550		4.35	4.22	4.23	3.60		
				our understanding	1	1	1	4	3	4			1138/1295			3.94	3.95	3.14
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	925/1388	4.07	4.42	4.28	4.49	4.07
		echniques succe		_	2	8	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.11	3.93	4.01	3.00
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	you provi			ground information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	***	3.49	4.11	3.96	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
a 1'.	- 1	a ana						_					_					
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors 	
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e 1	.3	Majo	or	0
28-55						_							3					
56-83						Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	16
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
	- · ·					<b>∩</b> ⊢¹	her				1	.4	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	16	
	I 0										Т	. 4						

Course-Section: PSYC 606 0101 University of Maryland ADULT PSYCHOPATHOLOGY Baltimore County

Title Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO Fall 2007

? 0

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1444/1639	3.60	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.60
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1449/1583	3.40	4.19	4.19	4.31	3.40
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1358/1504	3.20	4.02	4.05	4.29	3.20
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	882/1612	4.20	4.28	4.16	4.27	4.20
		was class canc			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 effective							0	3	2	0	3.40	1364/1579		4.05	4.08	4.17	3.40
1 772	. h	Lectur		0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	1007/1510	4 00	4 40	4 42	4 40	4 00	
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	1	1	3	T		1237/1518 1500/1520		4.49	4.43	4.49 4.79	4.00
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	1	3	0		,					
		_			0	0	0	0	2	3 2	1		1083/1517		4.35	4.27	4.32	4.00
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	2 0	_	1		1215/1550		4.35	4.22	4.23	3.80
5. Did au	idiovisua.	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	U	U	2	3	4.60	221/1295	4.60	4.11	3.94	3.95	4.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.11	3.93	4.01	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	lownod	Cum. GPA		Errogted Credes				Do	2020				т.				Majaza	
	.arned	Expected Grades					asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	0
28-55	8-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2																	
56-83						Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	5
84-150	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																	
Grad.	Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
I 0 Other											4							

Page 1431

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: PSYC 607 0101 University of Maryland Title DEV PSYCHOPATHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT Fall 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1432

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13	
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	-		4	5		Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	_	0	^	^	_	2	1	2 02	1202/1620	2 02	4 00	4 07	4 40	2 02
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	Τ.		1303/1639		4.29	4.27	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639		4.22	4.22	4.26	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5	4.83	209/1397		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		4.19	4.19	4.31	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	,		4.09	4.01	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	1.00	824/1504		4.02	4.05	4.29	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	4		166/1612		4.28	4.16	4.27	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	3		1067/1635		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		725/1520		4.72	4.70	4.79	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5		-,		4.35	4.27	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5				4.35	4.22	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	3		398/1295					
5. Did dddiovibadi ceomiqueb emanee your anderbeanding	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	-	3	1.33	330/1233	1.55		3.71	3.75	1.55
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
Frequ	ency	Dis	crib	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	6
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	
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PSYC 611 0101

DATA ANALYTIC PROC I

Title 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

	1				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	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	4.07	4.49	4.43	4.49	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	491/1520	4.58	4.72	4.70	4.79	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	4.27	4.23	4.56
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
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	_	U	U	2	2	,	1.13	303/12/3	1.13	7.11	3.94	3.95	1.13
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		****/ 240	****	3.49	4.11	3.96	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 611L 0101

DATA ANALYTIC PROC. I

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12

STAPLETON, LAUR Fall 2007

Page 1434 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	2	0	0	0	0	1	_	1 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		1318/1520		4.72	4.70	4.79	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	3		1016/1517		4.35	4.27	4.32	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	3		920/1550		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		4.11	3.94	3.95	
5. Dia addiovibadi eccimiques cimanee your anderseanding	5	Ü	J	Ü	_	3	5	1.22	101/12/5	1.22		3.71	3.75	1.22
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
<u> </u>														

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-		-	
				2	0						

#### Course-Section: PSYC 620 0101 University of Maryland Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT 6

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1435

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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

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

Course-Section: PSYC 623 0101 University of Maryland
Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN II Baltimore County
Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

9

University of Maryland Page 1436
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questio	nnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------	--------

							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	,
00_27		 Po	auir			a dore		n	Graduat		2	Maio	~~~~~	0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	9
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PSYC 635 0101 University of Maryland Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County

COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County BRODSKY, ANNE Fall 2007

0

0

I

Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1437 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

						Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera:	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	754/1639	4.40	4.29	4.27	4.42	4.40
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	6	4		1090/1639	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.00
		uestions reflect		_	0	14	0	0	0	1	0		****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.37	****
		uations reflect			0	0	0	1	4	5	5		1113/1583	3.93	4.19	4.19	4.31	3.93
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	377/1532		4.09	4.01	4.10	4.47
				o what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	8	4	3.93	908/1504	3.93	4.02	4.05	4.29	3.93
		g system clearly		-	0	0	2	3	2	2	6	3.47	1415/1612		4.28	4.16	4.27	3.47
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.71	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1005/1579	3.93	4.05	4.08	4.17	3.93
		Lecture	<u>-</u>															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	7	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1368/1518	3.75	4.49	4.43	4.49	3.75
		ctor seem intere			7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.72	4.70	4.79	4.75
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	0	2	2	3		1260/1517	3.75	4.35	4.27		3.75
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	2	1	0			1077/1550		4.35	4.22		4.00
				our understanding	7	4	1	0	0	1	2		838/1295		4.11			
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	749/1398	4.07	4.08	4.07	4.22	4.07
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.47	4.80
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	783/1388		4.42	4.28	4.49	4.33
		echniques succes			1	0	0	1	7	1	5	3.71	636/ 958	3.71	4.11		4.01	3.71
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t			announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.77	4.58	4.58	4.50
				lividual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	3		36/ 82		4.68	4.52	4.74	4.75
				what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	1		3.50	71/ 78		3.75	4.47	4.52	
	_	ons contribute t		-	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	55/ 80		4.42	4.47	4.50	4.25
		for grading made			11	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	82/ 82		4.08	4.16	4.37	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
a 11. =	. ,	a ana			_			_					_					
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grac							Rea	asons	; -			Ту.	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	4	Graduat	е	6	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 8				_				_	_		_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera.	Τ				1	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives							0	#### - Means there are not enough					ın

Other

Course-Section: PSYC 651 0101 University of Maryland Title COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1438

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

SONNENSCHEIN, S Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4					ructor	Course	_						
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1303/1639	3.83	4.29	4.27	4.42	3.83
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	1	3	6	2		1357/1639	3.75	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.75
		estions reflec			2	4	0	1	3	2	2		1238/1397	3.63	4.25	4.28	4.37	3.63
	_	uations reflect		_	2	2	0	2	1	4	3		1226/1583		4.19	4.19	4.31	3.80
				what you learned	2		0	0	4	4	4				4.09	4.01	4.10	4.00
				o what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	2	2		1303/1504		4.02	4.05	4.29	3.33
		g system clearl			2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	913/1612		4.28	4.16	4.27	4.17
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	3	9		884/1635		4.71	4.65		4.75
				hing effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	4	0		1430/1579		4.05	4.08	4.17	3.22
	Lecture																	
1 Were +1	he instr	actor's lecture		nrenared	2	0	0	1	3	3	5	4 00	1237/1518	4 00	4.49	4.43	4.49	4.00
					2	0	0	0	2	1	-		1129/1520	4.58	4.72	4.70	4.79	4.58
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				2	-	0	2	5				1405/1517		4.35	4.27	4.32	3.33
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	2	4	4			1328/1550			4.22		3.50
				our understanding	3	-	3	1	2	2			1259/1295					
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	r ccciniiques en	nance y	our unacrocanaing	3	5	5	_	2	4	U	2.50	1237/1273	2.50	1.11	3.71	3.75	2.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	0	1	5	3	0	3.22	813/ 958	3.22	4.11	3.93	4.01	3.22
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	1			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>.</b>
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Graduat	e	6	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	Grad. 6 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.0						
				? 1														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 680 0101 Title PERSONALITY Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER Fall 2007

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	5

4. Were special techniques successful

Page 1439 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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	Ο	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		4.11			3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	0		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

### Frequency Distribution

1 2 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 456/ 958 4.00 4.11 3.93 4.01 4.00

Credits E	arned	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	В	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		#### - Means there are not enough						
				P	0			responses to be significant						
				I	0	Other	3	-						
				2	Λ									

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Course-Section: PSYC 741 0101

5

TOPICS IN BEH MED

BEDIAKO, SHAWN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

Page 1440 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	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	****

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

Course-Section: PSYC 784 0101 University of Maryland INTERV: INFANCY/E CHILD Baltimore County

?

1

Page 1441 Title FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,

Enrollment:	5			
Questionnaires:	5	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.29	4.27	4.42	5.00
		ctor make clear			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						2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.19	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		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	
		Lectur	e															
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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.11	3.94	3.95	5.00
		Discus	sion															
				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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.11	3.93	4.01	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Reasons					Type				Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3			 mir		or Ma	iore		1	Graduate		2	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1000	quii,	Lu I	JI 110	ء ١٠٠٠	ی	_	Graduate	_	2	ı-ıa je	<i>,</i> _	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-gr	rad	3	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		OC.	iici a.	_				0	onder 9.	Luu	5	11011		3
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E14	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	-	3.30 1.00		P 0			2001					•	response				_	,
				I 0	Other						3	I COP CITO						
				± 0		001						_						