OII: PSIC 100 I

Title Intro To Psychology

Instructor: Garrett, Adia J

Enrollment: 209
Questionnaires: 123

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1244 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	anie	ncie	g		Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		NR 													
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	6	14	29	72	4.38	745/1509	4.23	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.38
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	16	36	66	4.36	753/1509	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.36
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	6	19	41	52	4.10	886/1287	3.94	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.10
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	33	2	4	20	27	34	4.00	979/1459	3.87	4.28	4.22	4.11	4.00
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	2	3	13	28	69	4.38	462/1406	4.31	4.23	4.09	4.02	4.38
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	41	4	3	17	23	31	3.95	886/1384	3.69	4.12	4.11	3.98	3.95
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	15	27	77	4.50	458/1489	4.30	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.50
8.	How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	117	4.95	292/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.95
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	23	43	38	4.12	774/1463	3.90	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.12
1	Lecture	-	0	0	_	1.0	2.2	CO	4 40	040/1420	4 51	4 55	1 10	4 44	4 40
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	2	12	33	69	4.40	940/1438	4.51	4.55	4.46	4.44	4.40
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	20	94	4.78	846/1421	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.66	4.78
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	4	11	39	62	4.37	768/1411	4.39		4.31	4.27	4.37
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	4	12 7	29	70	4.38	788/1405	4.29	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.38
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	U	3	4	/	31	70	4.40	354/1236	4.32	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.40
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	4	5	11	31	26	3.91	869/1260	3.86	4.25	4.14	3.95	3.91
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	3	3	20	18	32	3.96	939/1255	3.86	4.44	4.33	4.15	3.96
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	1	2	7	21	46	4.42	710/1258	4.18	4.42	4.38	4.18	4.42
	Were special techniques successful	47	16	1	9	15	17	18	3.70	636/ 873	3.65		4.03	3.89	3.70
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	1	2	0	3	3	4	3.58	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.06	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	111	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.14	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	2	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.48	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	112	3	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.29	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	112	3	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.15	****
1	Seminar	110	4	0	0	0	2	2	4 50	****/ 00		4 02	4 40	4 21	****
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	113	4	0	0	0	3	3		****/ 89	***	4.83	4.49	4.31	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	115	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.16	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	114	5	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 90		4.77	4.50	4.21	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	114	2	0	0	0	2	5 3	4.71	****/ 92 ****/ 93	****	4.87	4.38	4.21	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	114	3	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	^^^^/ 93		4.03	4.06	3.92	
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	114	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	114	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	114	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	114	3	0	0	1	2	3		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	114	3	0	0	2	1	3		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
			-	-	-	·	_	-		,				- -	
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	113	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	113	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	114	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	114	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	***

Title Intro To Psychology

Instructor: Garr Enrollment: 209 Questionnaires: 123

Garrett,Adia J 209 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1244 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	5
00-27	33	0.00-0.99	3	A	55	Required for Majors	42	Graduate 0	Major	14
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	48					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	12	General	55	Under-grad 123	Non-major	109
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	1					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means there	are not enoug	gh
				P	0			responses to be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		
				?	2					

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Intro To Psychology

Instructor: Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 133

208

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

O'Brien,Eileen Fall 2009

Page 1245 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 155 Student Co	urse	Eval	uatı	OII Q	uest	.10111	ialie	•						
			E~	eque	naio	\ C		Tna	tructor	Courac	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	MD	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
Quescions	MK	IVA			3	7	5	Mean	Kalik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	22	38	62	1 17	976/1509	1 22	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	6	26	50	47		1071/1509		4.30	4.26	4.25	4.02
	1	0		10	21	48	49					4.20		3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals			4						962/1287		4.27		4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	33	4	10	18	31	32		1159/1459		4.28	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	4	4	15	30			539/1406		4.23	4.09	4.02	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	65	8	6	14	18	18		1192/1384		4.12	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	9	11	35	71	4.28	- ,		4.30	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	1		123		408/1506		4.75	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	2	0	2	33	48	19	3.82	1044/1463	3.90	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	4	10	20	93	4.56	725/1438	4.51	4.55	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	6	26	96	4.70	968/1421	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	3	14	42	67	4.35	799/1411	4.39	4.45	4.31	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	5	10	16	26	69	4.14	974/1405	4.29	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	2	- 6	16	31		4.26			4.22		3.87	
or bia additional coomingach commise your anaciboanaing		_	_	ŭ		31	0.5	1120	103, 1230	1.52		1.00	3.07	1.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	105	0	0	3	6	11	8	3.86	****/1260	3.86	4.25	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	106	0	1	5	7	7	7	3.52	****/1255	3.86	4.44	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	106	0	2	2	8	8	7	3.59	****/1258	4.18	4.42	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	106	1	1	2	6	11	6	3.73	****/ 873	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.89	****
T all accordances														
Laboratory				•			_				4 00			
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	128	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/ 184		4.23	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 198		4.69	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	129	0	0	0	3	0	1		****/ 184		4.62	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	129	0	1	1	1	0	1		****/ 177		4.68	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	129	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	131	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	131	0	0	1	0	1	0	3 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	131	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 48		****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	131	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 47		****	4.51	4.53	****
3. was the instructor available for consultation	131	U	U	U	U	Т	Т	4.50	4/			±.51	+.55	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	130	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 49		****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	130	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	130	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 46		****		4.52	****
4 ** 11 6 11 1 / 1 1 1 1 1 1 7 7	1 2 0	•	•	_	_	_	-	2 (4.4.4.4.7	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 0 5	4 4 1	ale ale ale ale

130

0 2

0 1 3.67 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 4.47 ****

130 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.27 4.21 ****

Title Intro To Psychology

Instructor: O'Brien, Eileen

Enrollment: 208
Questionnaires: 133

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1245 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	
00-27	39	0.00-0.99	 5	 А	54	Required for Majors	23	Graduate 0	Major	6
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	В	50					
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	67	Under-grad 133	Non-major	127
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0			_		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	21	#### - Means there	are not enoug	h
				P	1			responses to be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2			
				?	4					

100 3 University of Maryland

Intro To Psychology Baltimore

Nail, Jennifer Fall 20

Enrollment: 199
Questionnaires: 96

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1246 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
a1														
General	2	0	1	1	17	31	41	1 11	1010/1509	4.23	4.38	4.31	1 10	1 1 1
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	2	0	1	4 5	17 12	40	36		1010/1509		4.38	4.31	4.18 4.25	4.14 4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	9	22									3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	2	5	18	33 21	27 21		1088/1287 1167/1459		4.27 4.28	4.30 4.22	4.24 4.11	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	14	28	46	4.26			4.23	4.22	4.11	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	42	5	3	12	18	14		1126/1384		4.12	4.09	3.98	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	42	3	3 6	10	33	42	4.12			4.12	4.11	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	1	38	52		1046/1506		4.75	4.17		4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	1	2	19	43	8		1101/1463		4.75	4.07	4.02	
	43	U	1	4	13	43	O	3.75	1101/1403	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	6	23	60	4.57	725/1438	4.51	4.55	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	7	22	60		1091/1421		4.80	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	9	25	53	4.45	,		4.45	4.31	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	12	21	53	4.36			4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	3	3	7	27	49	4.30	451/1236	4.32	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	4	2	13	14	19	3.81			4.25	4.14	3.95	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	2	4	17	11	18		1054/1255		4.44	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	6	12	9	24	3.94			4.42	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	43	18	1	2	14	11	7	3.60	671/ 873	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.89	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	90	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	92	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	91	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	92	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.15	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	90	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	91	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	91	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90		4.77	4.50	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	92	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	***	4.03	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	92	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	93	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title Intro To Psychology

Instructor: Nail, Jennifer

Enrollment: 199
Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1246 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	9	 А	37	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	37						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	29	Under-grad	96	Non-major	89
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	15	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_		_	
				?	0						

Title Child Developmental Ps

Instructor: Garrett, Adia J

Enrollment: 95
Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1247 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Se
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Ме
General														
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	51	4.82	235/1509	4.76	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	47	4.74	278/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.32	4
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	14	41	4.59	435/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.35	4
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	45	4.70	247/1459	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.30	4
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	l 0	1	0	1	3	8	48	4.72	187/1406	4.55	4.23	4.09	4.09	4
Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ied 0	1	1	0	4	15	40	4.55	313/1384	4.47	4.12	4.11	4.09	
Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	12	45	4.68	254/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.19	
How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	32	28	4.47	1108/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.61	
How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ess 12	1	2	0	2	16	28	4.42	452/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	49	4.75	447/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	59	4.97	215/1421	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.76	
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	52	4.82	232/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.37	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	11	48	4.74	369/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ıg 2	0	1	0	1	12	45	4.69	158/1236	4.72	4.22	4.00	4.11	
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1 21	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	194/1260	4.72	4.25	4.14	4.19	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	4	36	4.85	246/1255	4.78	4.44	4.33	4.37	
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 20	0	0	0	0	4	37	4.90	236/1258	4.87	4.42	4.38	4.44	
Were special techniques successful	20	12	0	0	3	13	13	4.34	288/ 873	4.41	4.00	4.03	4.04	
Laboratory														
Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	
Were you provided with adequate background informati	on 60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	
Were necessary materials available for lab activitie		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	
Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	
Self Paced														
Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	
Fr	equency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	les			Pes	ason	c c			Ty	ne			Majors	7

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	 А	24	Required for Majors	31	 Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	61	Non-major	37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	1						

Child Developmental Ps

Title Instructor: Garrett,Adia J

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 68 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1248 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Central			Question	ns		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ranl	k	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 1 0 0 20 46 4.60 482/1509 4.76 4.38 4.31 4.34 4.60 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 25 4.60 424/1509 4.73 4.00 4.26 4.32 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 25 34 4.50 482/1459 4.63 4.28 4.22 4.00 4.75 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.5																				
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 25 42 4.60 424/1509 4.73 4.30 4.26 4.32 4.69 1.00 there evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 6 19 25 42 4.60 424/1509 4.73 4.30 4.26 4.32 4.69 1.00 there evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 2 25 39 4.52 432/1459 4.63 4.28 4.09 4.09 4.72 6. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 25 39 4.52 432/1459 4.63 4.28 4.09 4.09 4.72 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1																				
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							-	_	_	-										
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 1 2 25 39 4.52 432/1459 4.63 4.28 4.22 4.30 4.52 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1						-	-	•	-	_				,						
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 16 50 4.72 187/1406 4.55 4.23 4.09 4.09 4.72 6. Did written assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 3 24 37 4.40 440/1384 4.47 4.12 4.11 4.09 4.40 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 6 12 48 4.64 308/1489 4.75 4.30 4.17 4.19 4.64 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 66 4.97 175/1506 4.81 4.75 4.67 4.61 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 3 0 0 0 2 16 39 4.65 222/1463 4.58 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.65 Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Section 1 0 0 0 0 1 17 49 4.72 514/1438 4.79 4.55 4.46 4.48 4.72 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0								•	-	-										
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2 3 3 24 37 4.40 440/1384 4.47 4.12 4.11 4.09 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 6 6 4.97 175/1506 4.81 4.75 4.30 4.17 4.19 4.64 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 65 4.97 175/1506 4.81 4.75 4.67 4.61 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 3 0 0 0 2 16 39 4.65 222/1463 4.58 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.65 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 17 49 4.72 514/1438 4.79 4.55 4.46 4.48 4.72 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 5 63 4.93 429/1421 4.96 4.80 4.73 4.76 4.93 3. Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 18 47 4.65 442/1411 4.80 4.45 4.31 4.37 4.65 4.09 4.00 4.11 4.72 4.09 4.00 4.11 4.72 4.09 4.00 4.11 4.72 4.09 4.00 4.11 4.72 4.09 4.00 4.11 4.72 4.09 4.00 4.11 4.72 4.09 4.00 4.11 4.72 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00								•												
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 6 12 48 4.64 308/1489 4.75 4.30 4.17 4.19 4.64 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 65 4.97 175/1506 4.81 4.75 4.67 4.61 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 3 0 0 0 2 16 39 4.65 222/1463 4.58 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.65 Lecture		_	-		_		_	-												
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 65 4.97 175/1506 4.81 4.75 4.67 4.61 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 3 0 0 2 16 39 4.65 222/1463 4.58 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.65 Lecture							-	_						- ,						
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 3 0 0 2 16 39 4.65 222/1463 4.58 4.16 4.09 4.08 4.65					ined		-	-	-											
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. 0 0 0 1 17 49 4.72 514/1438 4.79 4.55 4.46 4.48 4.72 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Were special techniques successful 8. Were your provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 00 0 0 1 5 00 0 0 0 0 0 0								•	-	-				- ,						
New the instructor's lectures well prepared	9. How woul	d you gr	ade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	8	3	0	0	2	16	39	4.65	222/14	463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 5 63 4.93 429/1421 4.96 4.80 4.73 4.76 4.93 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 18 47 4.65 442/1411 4.80 4.45 4.31 4.37 4.65 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 4 8 55 4.72 142/1236 4.75 4.47 4.32 4.39 4.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 4 8 55 4.72 142/1236 4.72 4.22 4.00 4.11 4.72 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 1 24 4.69 294/1260 4.72 4.25 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 0 0 0 3 8 23 4.59 519/1255 4.78 4.44 4.33 4.37 4.59 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34 0 0 0 0 3 8 23 4.59 519/1255 4.78 4.44 4.33 4.44 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 33 8 3 0 4 8 12 3.96 479/873 4.41 4.00 4.03 4.04 3.96 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 3. Were your provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were pour contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors OD-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 88-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		ere the instructor's lectures well prepared																		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 18 47 4.65 442/1411 4.80 4.45 4.31 4.37 4.65 4.0id the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 20 44 4.59 558/1405 4.75 4.47 4.32 4.39 4.59 5.0id audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 4 8 55 4.72 142/1236 4.72 4.22 4.00 4.11 4.72 Discussion	1. Were the	instruc	tor's lecture	es well	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	17	49	4.72	514/14	438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 4 20 44 4.59 558/1405 4.75 4.47 4.32 4.39 4.59 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 4 8 55 4.72 142/1236 4.72 4.22 4.00 4.11 4.72 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 1 1 24 4.69 294/1260 4.72 4.25 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 0 0 0 0 3 8 23 4.59 519/1255 4.78 4.44 4.33 4.37 4.59 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34 0 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 299/1258 4.78 4.42 4.38 4.44 4.85 4. Were special techniques successful 33 8 3 0 4 8 12 3.96 479/873 4.41 4.00 4.03 4.04 3.96 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Did the	instruct	or seem inter	rested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	63	4.93	429/14	421	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.93
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 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3. Required for Majors Tequency Distribution The poluments of the structure of the polument of	3. Was lect	ure mate	rial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	18	47	4.65	442/14	411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.65
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 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3. Required for Majors Tequency Distribution The poluments of the structure of the polument of	4. Did the	lectures	contribute	to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	4	20	44	4.59	558/14	405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.59
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 11 24 4.69 294/1260 4.72 4.25 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 0 0 0 3 8 23 4.59 519/1255 4.78 4.44 4.33 4.37 4.59 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34 0 0 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 299/1258 4.87 4.42 4.38 4.44 4.85 4. Were special techniques successful 33 8 3 0 4 8 12 3.96 479/873 4.41 4.00 4.03 4.04 3.96 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Did the lab increase understanding of the material							0	0	1	4	8	55	4.72	142/12	236	4.72	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.72
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 33 0 0 0 0 11 24 4.69 294/1260 4.72 4.25 4.14 4.19 4.69 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 0 0 0 3 8 23 4.59 519/1255 4.78 4.44 4.33 4.37 4.59 4.00 0 0 3 8 23 4.59 519/1255 4.78 4.44 4.33 4.37 4.59 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-	-	3															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34 0 0 0 3 8 23 4.59 519/1255 4.78 4.44 4.33 4.37 4.59 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34 0 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 299/1258 4.87 4.42 4.38 4.44 4.85 4. Were special techniques successful 33 8 3 0 4 8 12 3.96 479/873 4.41 4.00 4.03 4.04 3.96 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 Telectives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant																				
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34 0 0 0 0 5 29 4.85 299/1258 4.87 4.42 4.38 4.44 4.85 4. Were special techniques successful 33 8 3 0 4 8 12 3.96 479/873 4.41 4.00 4.03 4.04 3.96 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 2.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant										-				- ,						
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough February Feb														,						
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					d open discussion		-	-	-	-	-			,						
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced Self Pac	4. Were spe	cial tec	hniques succe	essful		33	8	3	0	4	8	12	3.96	479/ 8	873	4.41	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.96
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 66 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.23 4.16 4.54 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced Self Pac			Lahor:	atory																
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 67 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.69 4.22 4.51 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced	1 Did the	lah inar		-	f the material	66	1	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	E 00	****/ 1	101	****	1 22	1 16	1 51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.62 4.48 4.62 **** Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 6				_			_	-	-	-	U	1		, -						****
Self Paced 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 6	_	_	_		_		-	-	-	-	-	1		, -						
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 67 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 4.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 Telectives 6	3. Were nec	essary «	ateriais ava.	liable i	or lab activities	67	U	U	U	U	U	T	5.00	/	104		4.02	4.40	4.02	
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 6			Self	Paced																
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 0 Other 6	3. Were you	r contac	ts with the	instruct	or helpful	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	***	****	4.31	4.00	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 0 Other 6					Execu	ona	Diat	rib	ıtior	,										
00-27 7 0.00-0.99 0 A 33 Required for Majors 36 Graduate 1 Major 21 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 24 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 4 General 12 Under-grad 67 Non-major 47 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					rrequ	lency	DISC	LIDU	10101	1										
28-55	Credits Ear	ned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s				Тур	pe			Majors	
28-55	00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 33		Rec	uire	ed fo	 or M	 ajor	s 3		 Gradı	uate		1	Maic	 r	21
56-83	28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	В 24		-				- 3 -							3		
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 I 0 Other 6		4		3	C 4		General					1	2	Under	r-ar	rad 6	7	Non-	major	47
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 11 F 0 Electives 7 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 6		=										_							5	= -
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 6					= *		Electives						7	####	- N	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
I 0 Other 6					= -														_	
							Oth	ner					6			~				

2 200 4 University of Mar

Child Developmental Ps

Instructor: Hussey-Gardner,

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 36

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1249 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	193/1509	4.76	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	150/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	159/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	9	23	4.67	280/1459	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	7	6	20	4.23	623/1406	4.55	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	7	19	4.45	394/1384	4.47	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	55/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	0	5	22	4.68	203/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	197/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1421	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	83/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	154/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	137/1236	4.72	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	316/1260		4.25	4.14	4.19	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	221/1255	4.78	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	299/1258		4.42	4.38		4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	59/ 873	4.41	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.56	****
or were requirements for run reports orearry specifical	32		ŭ	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	3.00	, 103		1.00	1.10	1.50	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
	2.0	0	^	0	0	_	_	4 50	****/ 40	****	****	4 20	4 70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	1.50	, 10	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32 32	0 1	0	0	0	2 1	2		****/ 48 ****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		3	0	0	0	0	_	0,	****/ 47 ****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32 32	2	0	0	0	0	1 2		****/ 44	****	****	4.18 4.32	4.56 4.67	****
5. Did contelences help you carry out flerd accivities	34	۷	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00				7.34	4.0/	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
_														

Child Developmental Ps

Instructor: Hussey-Gardner,

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 36

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1249 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	 17	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	36	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Psychology Of Learning

Instructor: Borrero, John C

Enrollment: 102
Questionnaires: 79

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1250 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	Ο	0	2	22	53	4.64	434/1509	4.61	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	66	4.82	184/1509	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.34	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	15	61	4.76	261/1287	4.74	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	42	1	2	2	13	23	4.76	686/1459	4.76	4.27	4.22	4.30	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	42	13	2	14	13	28		1170/1406	3.94	4.23	4.22	4.09	3.52
3 3	1	63		1	14	Τ2			- ,					3.34 ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1		2	Τ	Τ		9		****/1384		4.12	4.11	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	71	4.88	103/1489	4.89	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	Ţ	0	0	0	59	17		1280/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	Τ	14	49	4.75	151/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	Ω	0	3	72	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	76	5.00	1/1421	4.99	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	11	64	4.85	190/1411	4.79	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0		71	4.93	120/1405	4.85	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	1	17	55	4.69	164/1236		4.22	4.00	4.11	4.69
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	-	1		U		Ι/	55	4.03	104/1230	4.04	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	4	14	17	4.37	528/1260	4.36	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	321/1255	4.58	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	337/1258	4.80	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	44	18	3	0	3	4	7	3.71	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
									,					
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	***	****	4.14	****	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	33	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	0	Major	34
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	13	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	79	Non-major	45
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	1						

Sigurdsson,Sigu

SYC 210 2 University of Maryland

Psychology Of Learning Baltimore

ng Baltimore Coun

Enrollment: 96
Questionnaires: 43

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1251 MAR 22, 2010 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
General	1	0	0	0	5	8	29	4.57	E16/1E00	4.61	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.57
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1 2	0	0	0	5 4	8 6	29 31	4.57	516/1509 367/1509	4.61	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	33	4.76	250/1287	4.74	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	487/1459	4.41	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	7	26	4.37	478/1406	3.94	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	466/1384	4.38	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	92/1489	4.89	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	175/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	19	16	4.42	452/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09		4.42
Lecture	•	0	0	0		•	2.0	4 00	010/1420	4 01	4 55	4 46	4 40	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	38	4.90	219/1438	4.91		4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	161/1421	4.99	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	11	30	4.73	327/1411	4.79	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0 3	0	0 1	1	8 6	32 27	4.76 4.59	345/1405 217/1236	4.85 4.64	4.47	4.32	4.39 4.11	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	U	1	3	О	21	4.59	21//1236	4.04	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	543/1260	4.36	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	681/1255	4.58	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	409/1258	4.80	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	22	12	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	3	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.56	****
• • • •														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced	4.7	•	•	0	0	^	^	F 00		4.4.4.4.		4 00	4 22	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41 41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37 ****/ 30	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4 1	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/ 30	^^^*	* * * *	4.27	^ ^ ^ *	***

Psychology Of Learning

Title Instructor: Sigurdsson, Sigu

Enrollment: 96 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1251 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	21	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	43	Non-major	40
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 215 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Title Paraprofessional Res C Instructor: Leisey, Kimberly

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 25

Page 1252 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	10	4.20	942/1509	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	471/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	250/1287	4.66	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	432/1459	4.45	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	400/1406	4.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	12	4.20	677/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	485/1489	4.47	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	233/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	500/1463	4.26	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	276/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	639/1421	4.76	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	376/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	473/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	298/1236	4.48	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	323/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	402/1255	4.81	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	409/1258		4.42	4.38	4.44	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	178/ 873	4.66	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.60
- -														

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 215 2 University of Maryland Title Paraprofessional Res C

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1253

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Leisey, Kimberly (Instr. A) Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25 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	-	0	•	•	_	_	1.4	4 50	500/1500	4 40	4 20	4 21	4 24	4 50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	598/1509	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	Ţ	3	5	15	4.42	683/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	Ţ	0	0	Ţ	- 7	15	4.61	426/1287	4.66	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Τ	0	0	Τ	0	11	12	4.42	602/1459	4.45	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	Τ	3	2	8	10	3.96	873/1406	4.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	619/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	17	4.46	527/1489	4.47	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	467/1463	4.26	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	531/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.71	483/1421	4.76	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	211/1411	4.70	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.71
	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	251/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	20 14		- ,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Т	2	U	T	3	4	14	4.41	354/1236	4.48	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	370/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.81	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	521/1258	4.68	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	139/ 873	4.66	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.69
1. Here apecial econniques auccessius		_	U	U	_	2	10	1.09	137, 073	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.01	1.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 215 2 University of Maryland Title Paraprofessional Res C Baltimore County

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1254

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	598/1509	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	683/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	426/1287	4.66	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	11	12	4.42	602/1459	4.45	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	873/1406	4.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	619/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	17	4.46	527/1489	4.47	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	853/1463	4.26	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	413/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1162/1421	4.76	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	321/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	236/1236	4.48	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.49
Discussion		0	•	0	-		0	4 55	200/1060	1 60	4 05	4 1 4	4 10	4 55
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	Ţ	4	10	4.57	370/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.81	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	521/1258	4.68	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	11	Τ	U	U	Т	۷	10	4.69	139/ 873	4.66	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.69

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Foundations Of Leaders

Title Foundations Of L Instructor: Lennon, Nicholas

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

Lennon, Nicholas

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1255 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	auer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1509	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1		12	4.45	590/1287	4.45	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	503/1459	4.47	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	446/1406	4.40	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5		4.35	505/1384	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0 1	2 6	18	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	Т	U	U	Т	ь	10	4.53	309/1463	4.53	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	247/1438	4.88	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	93/1236	4.82	4.22	4.00		4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0			4.83	324/1258	4.83		4.38	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	66/ 873	4.92	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.92
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate bachground information		Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	1.00	, 100		1.05	1.22	1.51	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
ni da wede														
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 10	****	****	4 20	4 70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19 19	0 0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48 ****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria						-	_		,	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 1,	****		4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, 1,	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 44	^^^	* * * * *	4.32	4.67	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Title Foundations Of Leaders

Instructor: Lennon, Nicholas

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1255 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 230 1 University of Maryland Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Title Psychology And Culture

Instructor: Leung, Christy Y

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 44

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1256

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	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	1	0	5	6	21	9	2	2.93	1480/1509	2.93	4.38	4.31	4.34	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	6	20	10	2	2.95	1473/1509	2.95	4.30	4.26	4.32	2.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	13	14	8	2	2.74	1280/1287	2.74	4.27	4.30	4.35	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	5	20	5	7	3.15	1405/1459	3.15	4.28	4.22	4.30	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	4	18	11	4	3.12	1317/1406	3.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	6	15	10	7	3.24	1290/1384	3.24	4.12	4.11	4.09	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	10	11	12	8	3.33	1362/1489	3.33	4.30	4.17	4.19	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	18	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	10	20	4	3	2.90	1411/1463	2.90	4.16	4.09	4.08	2.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	1.0	16	15	3 98	1222/1438	3.98	4.55	4.46	4.48	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	6	15	20		1289/1421	4.26	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	5	16	12	6		1315/1411	3.37	4.45	4.31	4.37	3.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	12	8	12		1279/1405	3.45	4.47	4.32	4.39	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	3	11	12	13	3.76	- ,		4.22	4.00	4.11	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	3	5	4	4	3.28	1115/1260	3.28	4.25	4.14	4.19	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	2	0	3	7	7	3.89	996/1255	3.89	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	873/1258	4.16	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	26	6	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.75

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	16	Under-grad	44	Non-major	35
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	1						

Abnormal Psychology

Title

Instructor: Freiberg, Karen

Enrollment: 167 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1257 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-0116	encie	'S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	20	57	4.42	698/1509	4.51	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	11	28	47	4.30	807/1509	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	23	55	4.44	590/1287	4.46	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	29	2	3	4	22	29	4.22		4.29	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	9	12	61	4.44	400/1406		4.23	4.09	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	75	1	2	2	2	8		****/1384		4.12	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	13	22	50	4.29	728/1489	4.45	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	82	6		1371/1506		4.75	4.67	4.61	4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	1	8	40	30	4.17	714/1463	4.11	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	11	22	54	4.43	904/1438	4.61	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	5	6	76	4.75	881/1421	4.82	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	7	20	56	4.46	677/1411		4.45	4.31	4.37	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	4	3	20	59	4.48	671/1405	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	4	7	20	55	4.39	373/1236		4.22	4.00	4.11	4.39
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	10	6	9	13	14		1113/1260		4.25	4.14	4.19	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	4	5	13	14	18		1077/1255		4.44	4.33	4.37	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	4	4	8	13	24	3.92	996/1258	4.01	4.42	4.38	4.44	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	36	46	3	3	1	1	1	2.33	****/ 873	***	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar	0.6	2	0	0	_	0	0	F 00	****	als als als als	4 00	4 40	F 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90		4.77	4.50		****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88 88	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92 ****/ 93	****	4.87 4.03	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	88	Τ	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	***/ 93	***	4.03	4.06	2.88	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Colf Darad														
Self Paced 1. Did golf-paged gygtom contribute to what you learned	07	0	0	0	1	0	3	/ E0	****/ 49	****	****	1 26	1 22	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	87	0		0	0	0	3	4.50 5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26 4.14	4.33	****
 Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 	88 88	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.UU ****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	88	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	***	****
J. were there enough proctors for all the students	00	U	U	U	U	U	د	5.00	/ 30			1.4/		

Title Abnormal Psychology

Instructor: Enrollment:

Freiberg, Karen

167 Questionnaires: 91 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1257 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	 А	45	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	29						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	90	Non-major	71
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	13	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 2 University of Maryland Abnormal Psychology

Questions

Title Baltimore County Instructor: Rice,Sara Carri Fall 2009

? 0

Enrollment:	64		
Questionnaires:	36	Student Course Evaluation Que	stionnaire

2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did oth 5. Did ass 6. Did wri 7. Was the 8. How mar	e instructe exam quader evalusigned restten asse grading	signments contr s system clearl was class canc	the exp t the exp t the exp the exp ute to v ibute to y explase	pected goals spected goals pected goals what you learned o what you learned	3 2 2 3 2 2 2 2 8	0 0 0 15 1 18 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 2 0 0 0 0	2 3 2 1 6 3 0 0 5	7 10 11 8 5 5 8 0 17	24 21 19 9 22 8 26 34 6	4.67 4.53 4.38 4.44 4.48 4.31 4.76 5.00 4.04	410/1509 519/1509 658/1287 553/1459 354/1406 557/1384 183/1489 1/1506 836/1463	4.51 4.40 4.46 4.29 4.36 4.06 4.45 4.67 4.11	4.38 4.30 4.27 4.28 4.23 4.12 4.30 4.75 4.16	4.31 4.26 4.30 4.22 4.09 4.11 4.17 4.67 4.09	4.34 4.32 4.35 4.30 4.09 4.09 4.19 4.61 4.08	4.67 4.53 4.38 4.44 4.48 4.31 4.76 5.00 4.04
3. Was led 4. Did the	n the subject splained clearly you learned	2 3 2 2 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 1	0 0 0 1 0	0 0 1 3 4	4 4 7 3 5	30 29 25 26 24	4.88 4.88 4.62 4.53 4.61	247/1438 614/1421 482/1411 615/1405 211/1236	4.61 4.82 4.51 4.56 4.54	4.55 4.80 4.45 4.47 4.22	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32 4.00	4.48 4.76 4.37 4.39 4.11	4.88 4.88 4.62 4.53 4.61			
2. Were al	Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned to where all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussions. Were special techniques successful							2 1 1 0	1 2 1 0	6 5 4 1	8 9 11 1	4.18 4.29 4.47 4.50	676/1260 755/1255 650/1258 ****/ 873	3.65 3.84 4.01 ****	4.25 4.44 4.42 4.00	4.14 4.33 4.38 4.03	4.19 4.37 4.44 4.04	4.18 4.29 4.47 ****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Тур	e 			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 4 C 3							quire neral		or M	ajor		5 2	Graduate Under-gr		0	Majo Non-	r major	18 18
84-150 Grad.	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 6 D 0						ectiv ner	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - M response				_	jh
		0.01						-										

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Page 1258 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Abnormal Psychology

Title Abnormal P Instructor: Resta,S P

Enrollment: 79
Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1259 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	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	5	0	0	1	4	13	26	4.45	661/1509			4.31	4.34	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	3	3	13	25	4.36	742/1509	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	4	12	28	4.55	481/1287	4.46	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	7	0	2	7	9	19	4.22	814/1459	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	6	12	22	4.16	693/1406	4.36	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	4	10	9	14		1009/1384		4.12	4.11	4.09	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	7	7	27	4.30	717/1489	4.45	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	175/1506		4.75	4.67	4.61	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	5	18	9	4.13	774/1463	4.11	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	3	2	7	31	4.53	762/1438	4.61	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	4	39	4.84	691/1421	4.82	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	5	8	28	4.44	689/1411	4.51	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	5	35	4.67	446/1405	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	2	11	28	4.63	193/1236	4.54	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	4	1	5	3	8	3.48	1058/1260	3.65	4.25	4.14	4.19	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	4	2	4	2	10	3.55	1117/1255	3.84	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	4	1	4	3	10	3.64	1114/1258	4.01	4.42	4.38	4.44	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	28	14	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
2. Did you crearly anderbeand your evaluation criteria	10	O	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	o	3.00	, 10			1.11	1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	49	Non-major	40
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1 .

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Adolescent Psychology

Instructor: Freiberg,Karen

Enrollment: 142

Title

Questionnaires: 84

Fall 2009

Page 1260 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eane	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	2	0	2	6	9	24	41	4.17	964/1509	4.17	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	5	10	24	42	4.23	880/1509	4.23	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	6	10	21	45	4.28	755/1287	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	50	1	2	2	11	16	4.22	814/1459	4.22	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	2	6	24	42	4.22	635/1406	4.22	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	61	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	****/1384	****	4.12	4.11	4.15	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	9	14	57	4.57	387/1489	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	3	8	66	3	3.86	1454/1506	3.86	4.75	4.67	4.67	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	1	1	12	27	23	4.09	804/1463	4.09	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	6	22	50	4.53	762/1438	4.53	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	3	8	63	4.74	915/1421	4.74	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	11	17	48	4.42			4.45	4.31	4.29	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	7	20	44	4.27	881/1405	4.27	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	3	2	4	15	53	4.47	306/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.47
Discussion	2.5	^	_	0	0	10	0.7	4 07	612/1060	4 07	4 05	4 1 4	4 00	4 07
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	2 1	0	8 4	12	27	4.27	613/1260	4.27	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0		-	2	6 2	38	4.63	474/1255	4.63	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0 3	2	_	_	43	4.76	421/1258	4.76 ****	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.76 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	35	30	3	1	1	4	10	3.89	****/ 873	* * * *	4.00	4.03	4.08	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	74	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	79	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	80	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	78	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	78	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 93	***	4.03	4.06	3.94	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	82	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	2	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.10	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0.1	2	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 44			4.32	4.40	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	81	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	***

Title Adolescent Psychology

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 84

Freiberg,Karen

142

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1260 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	28	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	34						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	84	Non-major	49
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	19	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	=	_		
				?	0						

Morakinyo,Sue E

University of Maryland

The Exceptional Child

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment: 19 Ouestionnaires: 16

Title

Instructor:

Page 1261 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires. 10 Student Coo	IIBC	Буат	iacic	ni Qu	CSCI	OIIII	alle							
			Fre	equer	cies			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	3		4.81	,	4.81		4.31	4.32	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	796/1509	4.31	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2		4.63	403/1287	4.63	4.27	4.30		4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47		4.47	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4		4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.23	4.09		4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.63	,	4.63	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10		555/1489	4.44	4.30	4.17		4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8			1182/1506	4.38	4.75	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4 27	1063/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.80	4.73		4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4		4.60	540/1405		4.47	4.32		4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	2	2		4.25	489/1236				4.07	
5. 21d dddioviddai ocomingdob emidnoc fodi anderbednaing	_	Ū	Ü	ŭ	_	_	-	1123	1037 1230	1.25		1.00	1.07	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	468/1258	4.71	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	853/ 873	2.50	4.00	4.03	4.08	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	***
Seminar	1 -	0	_	•	0	_	-	F 00	****	ale ale ale ale	4 62	4 = 4	4 68	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.32		****
5. Dia conferences help for early out field desivicies		Ü	J	Ü	O	Ü	_	3.00	, 11			1.32	1.10	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

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

? 0

Course-Section: PSYC 308 1
Title Child Maltreatment

Instructor: O'Brien, Eileen

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1262 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	15	17	4.24	901/1509	4.24	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	16	16	4.27	838/1509	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	14	14	4.08	894/1287	4.08	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	14	16	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	16	17	4.24	599/1406	4.24	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	4	4	15	10	3.85	978/1384	3.85	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	10	25	4.57	387/1489	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	7	18	5	3.93	944/1463	3.93	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	319/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	639/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	29	4.70	363/1411	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	26	4.62	513/1405	4.62	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	3	29	4.69	158/1236	4.69	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	4	5	14	4.16	681/1260	4.16	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	698/1255	4.36	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	521/1258	4.64	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	3	2	4	12	4.19	366/ 873	4.19	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.19

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	23
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: PSYC 317 1 University of Maryland Title Cognitive Psychology

Baltimore County Groninger, Lowel Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 45

Questionnaires: 21

Page 1263 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1214/1509	4.18	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	7	5	3.60	1331/1509	4.07	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	3	6	5	3.40	1188/1287	3.84	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	4	7	3.80	1167/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	656/1406	4.34	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	4	6	2	2.95	1335/1384	3.66	4.12	4.11	4.15	2.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	986/1489	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	583/1506	4.56	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	5	6	2	3.17	1364/1463	3.79	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	603/1438	4.70	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	1162/1421	4.71	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	6	6	3.68	1228/1411	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	8	3.90	1132/1405	4.28	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	3	4	9	3.89	779/1236	4.23	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	996/1260	3.94	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1094/1255	4.03	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	591/1258	4.49	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.88	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				?	1						

1

3.50-4.00

Grad.

Cognitive Psychology

Title Instructor: Alonso,Diane L

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1264 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	. 1 . 1	_	0	-	•	_		0.1	4 46	661 /1500	4 10	4 20	4 21	4 20	1 16
1. Did you gain new insights, skills fro		2	0	1	0	2	11	21	4.46	661/1509		4.38	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the ex	_	2	-	-	0	2	12	21	4.54	495/1509		4.30	4.26	4.25	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the		1	0	0	1	8	7	20	4.28	763/1287		4.27	4.30	4.33	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the ex		1	6 0	0	1 1	2	5	22	4.60	346/1459		4.28	4.22	4.26	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to	_	1	-			3	10	22	4.47	366/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute t		3	5 0	1	1 1	1	9 7	17	4.38	479/1384		4.12	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explanation	ainea	1	0	0	_	1		27	4.67	276/1489		4.30	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled		1	-	0	1	-	25	10		1280/1506		4.75	4.67	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	4	1	U	U	2	15	15	4.41	467/1463	3.79	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.41
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well		2	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	,		4.55	4.46	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested :		2	0	0	0	1	1	33	4.91	483/1421	4.71	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and e		2	0	0	1	2	13	19	4.43	713/1411	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what		2	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	473/1405		4.47	4.32	4.32	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance	your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	8	23	4.56	242/1236	4.23	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.56
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to	what you learned	8	0	1	0	6	6	16	4.24	629/1260	3.94	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.24
2. Were all students actively encourage	_	7	0	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	638/1255		4.44	4.33	4.37	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair an		7	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	690/1258		4.42	4.38	4.42	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful		7	13	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	545/ 873		4.00	4.03		3.88
Laboratory															
Laboratory	E +1	2.4	1	^	1	0	1	0	2 00	 / 104	****	4 00	1 10	4 07	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of		34	1	0	1	0 1	1	0	3.00	****/ 184 ****/ 198		4.23	4.16	4.07 4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate back	_	35 35		0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184			4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available in		35 35	1 1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 177		4.62 4.68	4.48		****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assis	stance	35	Τ	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	***/ 1//	****	4.08	4.30	4.30	
Seminar															
 Were assigned topics relevant to the 		36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89		4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for inc		36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92		4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to		36	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 90		4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what		36	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92		4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	<u> </u>	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	***
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to v	what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
	Frequ	iencv	Dist	ribı	ıt i oı	า									
	11040	.01107	215	0110		-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ту	ре 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	8	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	31
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0	в 12												-		
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3	C 4		Ger	nera:	l				3	Under-g	rad 3	36	Non-	major	6
84-150 7 3.00-3.49 2	D 0														
a 1 1 2 50 4 00 B									^	0.000		1			1

Electives

Other

0

3

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

1

Course-Section: PSYC 324 1 University of Maryland Page 1265 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Intro Interview Techn

Instructor: Rudow, Edward

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

								equei		s		Inst	ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	540/1509	4.55	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.55
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	424/1509	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	739/1287	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.30
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	5	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	938/1459	4.07	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.07
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ate to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	231/1406	4.65	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.65
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.75
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	762/1463	4.13	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.13
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	775/1438	4.53	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.53
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.79
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	456/1411	4.63	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.63
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	309/1405	4.79	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	4	3	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	752/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.92
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	258/1260	4.73	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.73
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	237/1255	4.87	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.87
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful	-	5	4	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	536/ 873	3.91	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.91
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	ason	c c			Ту	ne			Majors	
E																		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9	Required for Major					s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	11	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Conoral						2	TT			37		0	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General						3	Under-g	raa 2	20	Non-	major	9	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Floativos						0			.1			1-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Electives						2	#### - 1	Means t			_	m

Other

Ρ

. !

0

0

0

Course-Section: PSYC 330 1 University of Maryland Child Devel And Cultur

Title

Instructor: Cheah,Charissa

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 27 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1266

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	_	1 -	4.30	842/1509	4.39	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.30
	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.50	356/1509	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	18	4.59	435/1287	4.59	4.30	4.20	4.33	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	-	0	0	1	1	14	18		792/1459		4.27	4.30	4.33	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1		1	14	_	4.24	. ,	4.31				
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	Τ	3	4	10	14	4.04	790/1406	4.07	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Τ	3	12	11	4.22	649/1384	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	276/1489	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	981/1506	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	690/1463	4.23	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	413/1438	4.64	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	469/1411	4.64	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	354/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.41
		-	-		_				001, ==00					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	442/1260	4.62	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	287/1255	4.79	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	299/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	4	3	± 5	4.15	389/ 873	4.19	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.15
i. Note apoctal commisques adocessial	U	0	J	J	-	J	U	1.13	302/ 073	1.10	1.00	1.03	1.00	1.13

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Goldstein, Robin

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland

Child Devel And Cultur Baltimore County

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 29

Page 1267 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 29 Student Cot	ırse	Evalu	Jaci	on Q	uest.	TOIII	laire	:						
			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	623/1509	4.39	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	785/1509	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	4.59	4.27	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	6	4	16	4.38	638/1459	4.31	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	6	14	4.11	739/1406	4.07	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	367/1384	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	2	21	4.57	376/1489	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	466/1506	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	608/1463	4.23	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	800/1438	4.64	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	562/1421		4.80	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	20	4.64			4.45	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	446/1405	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	255/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	2.2	4.77	237/1260	1 60	4.25	1 11	1 22	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	22 23	4.77	333/1255		4.44	4.14	4.22 4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	23	4.77	363/1258		4.44		4.42	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	4	6	12	4.22	355/ 873		4.00	4.03		4.22
	_	_	_	-	_	_								
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	***	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	3 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
		•	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	Ŭ	-	2.00	, 1,			1.01	1.02	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 **** **** 4.14 5.00 ****

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.31 5.00 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	rades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Require	ed for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General		3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electiv	res	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P 0				responses to	be sig	gnificant	

I 0 Other 0 ? 0

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Experimental Psych I

Instructor: Stapleton,Laura Enrollment:

92 Questionnaires: 31

Fall 2009

Page 1268 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equer	ncies	3		Tngt	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	470/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	311/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	348/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	247/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	8	16	4.27	575/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	7	17	4.46	385/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	200/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	233/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	110/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	262/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	30	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	180/1411	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	27	4.81	285/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	5	22	4.45	314/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.45
Discussion			_		_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	535/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	474/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	605/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	224/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	1	1	2	14	4.42	64/ 184	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	29/ 198	4.60	4.69	4.22	4.17	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	38/ 184	4.68	4.62	4.48	4.52	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	50/ 177	4.57	4.68	4.36	4.30	4.74
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	9	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	88/ 165	4.30	4.60	4.18	4.11	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Experimental Psych I

Instructor: Stapleton, Laura

Enrollment: 92
Questionnaires: 31

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1268 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	Α	15	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				?	0						

· F51C 551 11

Title Experimental Psych I

Instructor: Alonso, Diane L

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1269 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	2		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	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	9	21	4.59	493/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	6	21	4.45	621/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	2	6	20	4.32	718/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	13	16	4.31	705/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	8	16	4.16	693/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	10	15	4.09	756/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	26	4.72	224/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	20	11	4.35	1194/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	826/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	8	19	4.47	852/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	537/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	9	15	4.16	957/1411	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	7	18	4.32	838/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	4	6	17	4.48	290/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.48
Discussion			_		_		_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	7	4	9	3.82	904/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	4	4	12	4.09	877/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	1	4	1	13		1013/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	405/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	8	0	7	3	11	2 21	172 / 104	4.08	4.23	1 16	4.07	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	2	2	9	$\frac{11}{14}$	3.31 4.07	173/ 184			4.16 4.22	4.07	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	3	1	1	1	4	19	4.50	119/ 198 105/ 184	4.60 4.68	4.69 4.62	4.22	4.17	4.07
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	3	3	5	17	4.17	103/ 104	4.57	4.62	4.46	4.30	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	1	1	2	5	18	4.17	68/ 165	4.30	4.60	4.18	4.30	4.17
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	-	2	_	_	2	,	10	1.11	00/ 103	1.50	4.00	1.10	7.11	1.11
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	1	0	1	4		****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Calf David														
Self Paced	0 -	_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	***	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	∠.00	****/ 30	* * * *	^ ^ * *	4.27	5.00	^ ^ * *

Title Experimental Psych I

Instructor: Alonso, Diane L

Enrollment: 44
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1269 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 2 University of Maryland Title Experimental Psych I Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Stapleton, Laura

Enrollment: 32 Ouestionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Page 1270

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

				94401		~			22 40 002	000100	Dopo	000		2000
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1222/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.00

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

University of Maryland Psych I Baltimore County

Experimental Psych I Pitts, Steven C

Instructor: Pitt
Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 43

Title

Fall 2009

Page 1271 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	g		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	16	22	4.44	686/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	412/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	31	4.68	337/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	6	7	20	4.42	586/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	1	8	6	19	3.92	909/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	677/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	8	29	4.59	364/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	2	38	4.85	682/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	16	18	4.49	353/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	175/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	429/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	6	30	4.67	416/1411	4.67		4.31	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	10	27	4.64	486/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	330/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.43
Discussion			_	_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	4	3	14	4.22	653/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	3	4	4	11	3.91	983/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	9	6	8	3.96	972/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	20	18	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	47/ 184	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	14/ 198	4.60	4.69	4.22	4.17	4.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	5	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	60/ 184	4.68	4.62	4.48	4.52	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	35/ 177	4.57	4.68	4.36	4.30	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	7	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	****/ 165	4.30	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	0	1	1	2 75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	2	0	0	0	2		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	1	3	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
1. 11. Sometimes here you carry out from accryticies		-	3	5	3	J	_	3.00	, 11					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.23	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	0	0	0	1	2	0.	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Title Experimental Psych I

Instructor: Pitts, Steven C

Enrollment: 72
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1271 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	 6	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	20						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1 Title

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Experimental Psych II Blass, Thomas (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: Fall 2009

MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1272

Questionnaires: 32 Student Cou	ırse	Evalı	uatio	on Q	uest	ionn	aire	:					
			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Instructor	Course D	ept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2 	3	4	5	Mean Rank	Mean M	lean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	14	6	3.63 1359/1509	3.62 4	.38	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	9	7	3.44 1394/1509	3.61 4	.30	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	13	8	6	3.41 1188/1287	3.57 4	.27	4.30	4.33	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	11	3.91 1088/1459	3.98 4	.28	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	7	10	3.42 1231/1406	3.30 4	.23	4.09	4.12	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	11	13	4.00 807/1384	3.98 4	.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	9	10	3.68 1232/1489	3.79 4	.30	4.17	4.14	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	19	4.55 1038/1506	4.68 4	.75	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	7	7	12	1	3.26 1338/1463	3.59 4	.16	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	1	8	11	8	3.56 1363/1438	3.94 4	.55	4.46	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	22	4.41 1217/1421	4.17 4	.80	4.73	4.73	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	4	9	9	5	3.16 1347/1411	3.74 4	.45	4.31	4.29	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	8	12	8	3.69 1213/1405	3.69 4	.47	4.32	4.32	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	4	0	7	6	5	3.36 1045/1236	3.42 4	.22	4.00	4.07	3.36
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58 1021/1260	3.67 4	.25	4.14	4.22	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27 776/1255	4.19 4	.44	4.33	4.37	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	8	11	4.08 910/1258	3.90 4	.42	4.38	4.42	4.08
4 Marie and the desired and the second of the	0	11	0	2	2	4	_	2 15 706/ 072			4 02		2 1 5

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5 2	4	9 8	9 12	5 8		1347/1411 1213/1405	3.74 3.69	4.45 4.47	4.31	4.29	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	4	0	7	12 6	5		1045/1236	3.69		4.32	4.32	3.84	
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	10	7	U	,	U	J	3.30	1045/1250	3.12	7.22	1.00	1.07	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1021/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	776/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	8	11	4.08	910/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	786/ 873	3.41	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	***	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	***	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	***	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	***	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	***	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	***	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	Ο	3 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****		4.41	4.34	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	•		****/ 47	****		4.51	4.62	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	***	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	Ω	1	0	0	Ω	2 00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 46	****		4.31		***	
J. Were your contracts with the instructor helpful	2 1	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 40			I. J.	5.00		

31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** **** 4.05 5.00 **** 31 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.27 5.00 ****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1 Title

Experimental Psych II

Blass, Thomas (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 45 Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1272 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 32

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title Experimental Psych II Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2009

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 32 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1273 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General	_	0	0	0	0	1.4	_	2 62	1250/1500	2 60	4 20	4 21	4 20	2 62
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2 2	2 5	8 9	14 9	6 7		1359/1509		4.38	4.31 4.26	4.32	3.63 3.44
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	2	3	13	8	6		1394/1509 1188/1287		4.30 4.27	4.20	4.25	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	11		1088/1459		4.27	4.22	4.33	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	7	10		1231/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	11	13		807/1384		4.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	9	10		1232/1489		4.30	4.17	4.14	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	19		1038/1506		4.75	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	702/1463		4.16	4.09	4.08	3.65
J. Now would fou grade the overall teaching effectiveness		-	Ü	O	-	,	,	1.17	702/1103	3.35	1.10	1.05	1.00	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1086/1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	1228/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	758/1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	859/1405		4.47	4.32	4.32	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	8	7	2 50	1021/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	776/1255		4.44	4.14	4.37	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	8	11	4.08	910/1258		4.42	4.38	4.42	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	786/ 873			4.03		3.15
i. Were special recinityaes successial	O		2	2	5	-	2	3.13	7007 073	3.11	1.00	1.05	1.00	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92		4.63	4.49	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90		4.77	4.50	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 93		4.03	4.06	3.94	****
or more orrootta ror grading made orodr	-	Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, , ,		1.05	1.00	3.71	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****
5 1														

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1 University of Maryland Page 1273 Title Experimental Psych II Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 45 Fall 2009

MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title Experimental Psych II

Instructor: (Instr. C)
Enrollment: 45 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029 Ouestionnaires: 32 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Page 1274

MAR 22, 2010

	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	14	6	3.63	1359/1509	3.62	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.63
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	9	7	3.44	1394/1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.44
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	13	8	6		1188/1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.41
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	11		1088/1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.91
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	7	10		1231/1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.42
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	11	13	4.00		3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	9	10		1232/1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.68
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	19		1038/1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.55
	-		1	0	1	6	6	19							
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	U	Т	О	О	1	3.50	1241/1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.65
	Lecture														
1		1.0	0	^	^	_	-	0	2 70	1204/1420	2 04	4 55	1 10	4 42	2 06
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	5	7	2		1304/1438		4.55	4.46	4.43	3.86
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	9	4		1306/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.34
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	4	4	5		1126/1411		4.45	4.31	4.29	3.82
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	7	5	1		1257/1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.84
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	8	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	****/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.36
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	8	7		1021/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.58
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	776/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.27
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	8	11	4.08	910/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.08
4.	Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	786/ 873	3.41	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.15
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	***
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
										,					
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
٥.	were criteria for grading made crear	31	O	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 23		1.03	1.00	3.71	
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
								-		****/ 47	****	****			***
	Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		,	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	U	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	* * * *		4.18	4.47	
	Calf Danad														
-	Self Paced	2 1	0		-	^	_	^	0 00	4444/ 40			1 00	F 00	
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Experimental Psych II

Instructor: Enrollment: 45

(Instr. C)

Questionnaires: 32

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1274

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 10 University of Maryland Title

Experimental Psych II Baltimore County Garrett,Adia J Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 14

Page 1275 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	1	0	_	-	1 26	770/1500	2 (0	4 20	4 21	4 20	1 26
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ţ	1	0	11	4.36	778/1509	3.62		4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Τ		11	4.71	300/1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	-	2	Ţ	11	4.64	381/1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	302/1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	Τ	2	2	3	5		1087/1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	225/1384	3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	376/1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	682/1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	396/1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	712/1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	9		1162/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	789/1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	808/1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	580/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.14
5. Dia addiovibadi ecciniques emanec your anderseanding	-	5	Ü	-	-	_	-		30071230	3.12	1.22	1.00	1.07	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	528/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	620/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	383/ 873	3.41	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.17
T all assat assat														
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	•	•	-	•	4 00		also also also also	4 00	4 16	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	U	0	1	0		****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	Ţ	0		****/ 184		4.62	4.48	4.52	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	Ü	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	***

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

University of Maryland Experimental Psych II Groninger,Lowel

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9 Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1276 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Ouestions								_	ncies			Inst	ructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4		Mean	Ra	nk 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did yo	ou gain new	v insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	3	4	2	0	2.89	1484/	1509	3.62	4.38	4.31	4.32	2.89
2. Did th	ne instruct	or make clear	the expe	ected goals	0	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1463/	1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflec	t the exp	pected goals	0	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1247/	1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.00
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the expe	ected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1292/	1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.56
5. Did as	ssigned rea	adings contrib	ute to wl	nat you learned	0	0	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1390/	1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	2.56
6. Did wr	ritten assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	4	1	3.22	1292/	1384	3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.22
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearl;	y explair	ned	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1359/	1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.33
8. How ma	any times w	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/	1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	2	0	1	3	1	2	0	2.57	1439/	1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	2.57
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	the instruc	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1364/	1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.56
2. Did th	ne instruct	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1404/	1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	3.33
3. Was le	ecture mate	erial presente	d and exp	olained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1380/	1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	2.89
4. Did th	ne lectures	contribute t	o what yo	ou learned	0	0	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	1387/	1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	2.56
				ur understanding	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1179/	1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	2.75
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	lass discus	ssions contrib	ute to wh	nat you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1120/	1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.25
					5	0	1	0	0	2	1		1127/		4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.50
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				5	0	1	1	1	0	1		1244/		3.90			4.42	2.75
1 5 1 1 1 1		Labora	_		_	-	•	0	•	-	0	4 00		104	****	4 00	4 16	4 05	als als als als
		rease understa	_		7	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/			4.23	4.16	4.07	****
				round information	7	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/		***	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
	_			r lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
		ructor provid			7 7	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ ****/		****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. were i	requirement	s for lab rep	orts clea	arly specified	/	1	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/	165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	
		Field																	
				at you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	understand yo	ur evalua	ation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	elf-paced s	system contrib	ute to wh	nat you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	1												
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	pe			Majors	<b>,</b>
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	8	Gra	duate	е	0	Majo	or	7
28-55 56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	в 2 С 1		Car	neral	1				0	ביוו	er-gi	rad	9	Non	-maior	2
	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					Ger	ıcıd.	L				U	uila	er - 91	Lau	J	MOI1-	-major	۷
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						m1.	ectiv	700				0	щщи	# . *	Means t	horo -	.xo xo+	ono	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0						ъ⊥€	=CLI\	ves				U			means t es to b			_	111
I 0						Oth	nar					0	res	POITS6	es co L	e sign	ııııcdı	10	
				5 U		ULI	ıcı					U							
	? 0																		

Physiological Psycholo

Title Instructor: Provine,Robert

Enrollment: 149 Questionnaires: 106 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1277 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque	encie	es 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	8	21	32	39	3.90	1214/1509	4.18	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	10	9	29	23	32	3.56	1347/1509	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	10	19	22	26	26	3.38	1195/1287	3.60	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	15	14	20	29	15		1402/1459		4.28	4.22	4.26	3.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	14	14	34	35		1001/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	22	15	29	20	16		1337/1384		4.12	4.11	4.15	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	3	6 1	12	22 0	59 101	4.25	760/1489 175/1506		4.30 4.75	4.17 4.67	4.14 4.67	4.25 4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		1	9	9	24	23	13		1329/1463		4.75	4.07	4.07	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	6	12	17	28	38	3.79	1300/1438	4.30	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	5	4	22	71	4.56	1123/1421	4.68	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	13	9	28	29	22		1313/1411		4.45	4.31	4.29	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	10	16	27	42		1154/1405		4.47	4.32	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	52	10	9	14	8	6	2.81	1174/1236	3.80	4.22	4.00	4.07	2.81
Discussion	4.5	0	1.0	_	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.00	1160/1066		4 05	4 1 4	4 00	0.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47 47	0	16 9	6 6	13 15	11 13	13 16		1169/1260 1163/1255		4.25 4.44	4.14	4.22 4.37	2.98 3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	12	10	11	11	15		1216/1258		4.42	4.38	4.42	3.12
4. Were special techniques successful	47	49	3	3	0	1	3		****/ 873		4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	n 103	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	103	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	104	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 48		****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation	104 103	0	2 1	0 1	0	0	0		****/ 48 ****/ 47		****	4.41 4.51	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	103	1	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 47		****	4.18	4.62	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	103	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44		****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	104	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	103	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	104	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	, -		****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****
Free	quency	/ Dis	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	S			Re	eason	ıs			ΤΣ	фe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 24		 R€	 equir	ed f	or M	ajor	8	1	 Graduat	:	0	Majo	 r	71
28-55 6 1.00-1.99 1 B 50 56-83 16 2.00-2.99 15 C 18		C	- enera	. 1				4	IIndon o	rad 10	16	Non	major	35
84-150 33 3.00-3.49 16 D 0		GE	enera	ıΤ				7	onder-g	jiau Il	, 0	NOI1-	ilia JOE	33
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 24 F 0		E	Lecti	ves				8		Means t				h
P 0								4	respons	ses to b	e sign	ıııcan	I L	

Other

4

0

I

Course-Section: PSYC 335 2 University of Maryland Title Physiological Psycholo Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Lynch, Minda R

Instructor: Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1278

Job IRBR3029

					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 in	nsights,skills from	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	661/1509	4.18	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.45
2. Did the instructor	make clear the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	838/1509	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam quest	ions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1069/1287	3.60	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.82
4. Did other evaluation	ons reflect the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	843/1459	3.67	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned reading	ngs contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	563/1406	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignm	-	-	0	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1126/1384	3.28	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.64
7. Was the grading sys		-	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	527/1489	4.35	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.99	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade		hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	853/1463	3.64	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.00
1 3		5														
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor	r's lectures well :	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.30	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor	seem interested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	794/1421	4.68	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture materia	al presented and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	376/1411	4.04	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.70
4. Did the lectures co	ontribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1405	4.23	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual ted	chniques enhance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	100/1236	3.80	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.80
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussion		_	2	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	982/1260	3.32	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.67
2. Were all students a			2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	904/1255	3.68	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor	_	d open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	770/1258	3.73	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techni		3	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****	
	Fr															
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors		

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Bediako,Shawn M Fall 2009
Enrollment: 65
Questionnaires: 41 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 340 1

Social Psychology

Title

28-55

56-83

Grad.

84-150

2

7

0

15

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

5

9

8

В

С

D

F

Ρ

I

?

17

4

0

0

0

0

1

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	13	24	4.46	648/1509	4.53	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.4
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	30	4.66	367/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.6
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	11	29	4.66	370/1287	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	4	4	19	4.43	586/1459	4.38	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	32	4.68	208/1406	4.66	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	742/1384	3.72	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	33	4.73	208/1489	4.76	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.
. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	30	4.73	870/1506	4.87	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	1	14	16	4.30	579/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	175/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	36	4.88	614/1421	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.73	4
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	222/1411	4.72	4.45	4.31	4.29	4
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	33	4.75	345/1405	4.80	4.47	4.32	4.32	4
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	9	26	4.58	229/1236	4.43	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	505/1260	4.55	4.25	4.14	4.22	4
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	463/1255	4.63	4.44	4.33	4.37	4
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	312/1258	4.77	4.42	4.38	4.42	4
Were special techniques successful	16	3	3	3	2	6	8	3.59	674/ 873	3.30	4.00	4.03	4.08	3
Seminar														
. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	*
. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	*
. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	*
. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	* *
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 14		Re	 quir	ed f	 or M	 Iaior	s 2	 ?9	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	 2

General

Other

Electives

1

2

0

Under-grad

41

responses to be significant

#### - Means there are not enough

Non-major 18

Page 1279

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: PSYC 340 2
Title Social Psych

y Baltimore Count

Title Social Psychology Instructor: Rudow, Edward

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1280 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

TillCIIC -	±,				
ionnaires:	15	Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	_				_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	482/1509	4.53	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	201/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	566/1287	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	686/1459	4.38	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	238/1406	4.66	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	1	1	2		1264/1384	3.72	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.33
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	167/1489	4.76	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	4.87	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	325/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	,		4.55	4.46	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	482/1411	4.72	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	228/1405	4.80	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	474/1236	4.43	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	287/1260	4.55	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	494/1255	4.63	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	486/1258	4.77	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.30	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 342 1 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Psych Of Aggression Anderson, Robert

Enrollment: 81 Ouestionnaires: 72

Instructor:

Grad.

3.50-4.00 9

F 0

0

0

1

P

I

Fall 2009

Page 1281 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	^	^	0	0	0	60	4 02	010/1500	4 02	4 20	4 21	4 20	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0 1	0	0	0 1	2	8 17	62 53	4.83	218/1509 300/1509		4.38	4.31 4.26	4.32 4.25	4.83 4.72
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	14	53 58	4.72	208/1287		4.30	4.26	4.25	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	4	0	7	19	33	4.81	803/1459		4.27	4.30	4.33	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	21	33 45	4.22	332/1406		4.23	4.22	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	8	22	35	4.17	701/1384		4.12	4.11	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	<i>5</i>	15	17		4.17	937/1489		4.12	4.17	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7		4.90	583/1506		4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0			4.80	118/1463			4.09	4.08	4.80
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	_	U	U	U	11	57	1.00	110/1403	1.00	4.10	4.00	1.00	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	14	54	4.74	463/1438	4.74	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	70	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	14	54	4.74	315/1411	4.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	64	4.91	154/1405	4.91	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	8	21	39	4.46	314/1236	4.46	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.46
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	3	10	27	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.25	1 11	4.22	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32 32	0	0	1	2	7	30	4.60	453/1255		4.45	4.14 4.33	4.22	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	1	8	30	4.74	433/1258		4.44	4.38	4.42	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	33	22	1	1	4	4	30 7		****/ 873		4.42	4.30	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	22	Τ	1	4	4	,	3.00	/ 6/3		4.00	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	68	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92		4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90		4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	1	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 92		4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	1	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 93		4.03	4.06	3.94	****
J. Well differia for grading made crear	00	_	O	O	_	O		1.33	, ,,		1.05	1.00	3.71	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced	<b>-</b> 1	0	•	0	0	•	-	F 00	***** / 10	als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 06	F 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71 71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49 ****/ 41		****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	/ 1	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 41	^ ^ ^ ^		4.14	5.00	
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
										<u> </u>				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 32		Rec	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	36
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 22			_					_			_			
56-83 6 2.00-2.99 4 C 0		Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 7	2	Non-	major	36
84-150 15 3.00-3.49 15 D 0														

Electives

Other

25

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 357 1 Title Psyc Of Women Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen

50

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1282 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 110	aain n	General w insights,skil		n this source	1	0	2	0	5	_	26	4.39	734/1509	4.39	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.39
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	4	5	Ω	21	4.21	901/1509	4.39	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.39
		uestions reflect			1	0	3	2	10	8	15		1081/1287	3.79	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.79
		uations reflect			1	2	2	4	3	11	16		1011/1459	3.97	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.97
			_	what you learned	1	0	4	1	1	7	25	4.26	575/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	4.26
				what you learned	2	0	2	2	7	7	19	4.05	779/1384		4.12	4.11	4.15	4.05
		g system clearly			3	0	0	3	6	9	18	4.17	854/1489	4.17	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.17
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1506		4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
				ning effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	14	12	4.19	690/1463		4.16	4.09	4.08	4.19
	1 1 1			5														
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	prepared	2	0	0	1	5	1	30	4.62	646/1438	4.62	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.62
2. Did th	id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	1	3	33	4.86	639/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.86
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	1	5	4	27	4.54	568/1411	4.54	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.54
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	3	1	5	1	27	4.30	866/1405	4.30	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.30
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	4	0	2	1	3	5	24	4.37	383/1236	4.37	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.37
		Discus				_			_	_								
				what you learned	16	0	1	0	5	3	14	4.26	613/1260		4.25	4.14	4.22	4.26
				d to participate	16	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	453/1255	4.65	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.65
		_		d open discussion	16	0 5	1	0	5 5	3	14	4.26	813/1258	4.26	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.26
4. were s	special te	echniques succes	ssiui		16	5	U	2	5	2	9	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	25
28-55										-						_		
56-83	-83 8 2.00-2.99 5 C 3					Ge	nera	l				3	Under-g	rad 3	9	Non-	major	14
84-150																		
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ves			1	.1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					1						
	I 0 ? 1																	

Title Psychology Of Motivati

Instructor: Rabin, B M

Enrollment: 93
Questionnaires: 46

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1283 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

							_	ncie				tructo		Course	_		Level	Sect	
		Question	s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rai	nk 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did y	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	1	0	11	8	12	8	6	2.78	1487/	1509	2.78	4.38	4.31	4.32	2.78
2. Did t	he instruc	tor make clear	the exp	ected goals	2	0	7	7	17	5	8	3.00	1463/	1509	3.00	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did t	he exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	1	0	6	6	13	11	9	3.24	1222/	1287	3.24	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.24
4. Did o	ther evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	39	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/	1459	****	4.28	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did a	assigned re	adings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	3	3	6	11	12	7	4	2.80	1369/	1406	2.80	4.23	4.09	4.12	2.80
6. Did w	ritten ass	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	2	40	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/	1384	****	4.12	4.11	4.15	****
		system clearl		ned	3	1	3	3	8	9	19	3.90	1106/	1489	3.90	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.90
		was class canc			3	0	1	0	10	14	18	4.12	1340/	1506	4.12	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.12
9. How w	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	8	2	8	8	11	8	1	2.61	1438/	1463	2.61	4.16	4.09	4.08	2.61
		Lectur	е																
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	3	0	0	3	6	12	22	4.23	1086/	1438	4.23	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.23
2. Did t	he instruc	tor seem inter	ested ir	the subject	4	0	0	1	11	11	19	4.14	1322/	1421	4.14	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.14
3. Was 1	ecture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	4	0	6	9	10	10	7	3.07	1356/	1411	3.07	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.07
4. Did t	he lecture	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	4	0	2	10	10	9	11	3.40	1294/	1405	3.40	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.40
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	5	11	5	2	9	6	8	3.33	1056/	1236	3.33	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.33
		Discus																	
1. Did c	class discu	what you learned	21	0	10	2	9	3	1	2.32	1249/	1260	2.32	4.25	4.14	4.22	2.32		
		to participate	21	0	9	4	4	5	3	2.56	1238/	1255	2.56	4.44	4.33	4.37	2.56		
		-	_	d open discussion	21	0	6	6	7	3	3		1247/		2.64	4.42	4.38	4.42	2.64
4. Were	special te	chniques succe	ssful	-	21	22	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/	873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
		Labora	torv																
2. Were	you provid		_	ground information	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
		Field	Work																
1 Did f	ield evner			nat you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
				ation criteria	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
		could you disc			45	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/	47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
		0-16	D																
1 54 4	alf paged	Self		that trouglearmed	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/	40	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
		system contrib ions make clea		what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	49 41	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
		cts with the i			44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	46	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were	your conta	cts with the i	nstructo	or neipiui	44	1	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	,	40			4.31	5.00	
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utic	n												
Credits	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	ason	s				Тур	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2					or M				Grad	duate		1	Majo		37
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 19		ΛE	.quil	cu I	OT 141	בטר ה.	۷ ۷	J	GI di	auatt	-	_	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	<i>51</i>
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 9		Co	nera	1				0	IInd	er-gi	rad 4	15	Non-	-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-2.99	9	D 3		36	c. a	_				U	ona	cr - 91	- uu -	1.5	INOII-	ilia JUI	J
	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						ecti	WAG.				3	###	± _ 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	rh
JI dd.	_	3.30 1.00	U	P 0		11.11	CCLI	v CD				5				nere a		_	J++
				I O		O+	her					4	100	_ 01150	L				
				_ 0								•							

Title Sensation And Percepti

Instructor: Provine, Robert

Enrollment: 146 Questionnaires: 91

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1284 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

2

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1.0	0	1	11	17	26	2.2	2 (5	1245/1500	2 (5	4 20	4 21	4 20	2 (5
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10 10	0	4 11	11 12	17 20	26 26	23 12		1345/1509 1442/1509		4.38	4.31	4.32	3.65 3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	1	5	24	14	21	16		1223/1287		4.27	4.30	4.23	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	8	15	16	19	14	9		1450/1459		4.28	4.22	4.26	2.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	2	8	7	15	29	18		1162/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		1	20	18	22	14	4		1369/1384			4.11	4.15	2.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	3	7	8	20	40	4.12			4.30	4.17	4.14	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	1	78	4.99			4.75	4.67	4.67	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		2	3	13	30	15			1370/1463			4.09	4.08	3.15
Lecture			_	_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	6	5	21	20	28		1322/1438		4.55	4.46	4.43	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	2	6	23	48		1200/1421		4.80	4.73	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	9	16	22	22	11		1351/1411		4.45	4.31	4.29	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	10 8	8	20	20	22		1279/1405			4.32	4.32	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	13	8	3	14	22	17	3.58	950/1236	3.58	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	7	7	5	11	8	3.16	1140/1260	3.16	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	6	4	11	9	9	3.28	1175/1255	3.28	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	8	1	10	10	10	3.33	1184/1258	3.33	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	52	31	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	89	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	***
Field Work				•	_	•						4 00	4	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 48		****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	1 1	1	1	0	0		****/ 48		****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	88			0	0	-	0		****/ 47 ****/ 47		****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	88 88	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47 ****/ 44		****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	00	۷	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 44			4.32	4.40	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
Free	uency	/ Dis	strik	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ເຮ			Ту	pe 			Majors	3
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 19		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 5	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	52
28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 37														
56-83 11 2.00-2.99 8 C 8		Ge	enera	1				1	Under-g	rad 9	91	Non-	major	39
84-150 25 3.00-3.49 18 D 1								_			-1			.1-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 14 F 0		ΕI	.ecti	ves				6	#### -		there a		_	_J n

Other

Ρ

Ι

0

0

1

Course-Section: PSYC 380 1
Title Personality
Instructor: Resta,S P
Enrollment: 78

Questionnaires: 39

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1285 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	:		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		General																
		w insights,skil			6	0	0	0	7	9	17	4.30	833/1509	4.30	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.30
		tor make clear			6	0	1	0	1	8	23	4.58	459/1509	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.58
		estions reflect			6	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	293/1287	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.73
		ations reflect			6	4	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	400/1459	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.55
	_	-		vhat you learned	6	2	1	0	1	12	17	4.42	434/1406	4.42	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.42
		_		what you learned	6	2	0	1	3	10	17	4.39	466/1384		4.12	4.11	4.15	4.39
		system clearly	_	ined	6	0	0	1	2	8	22	4.55	411/1489	4.55	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.55
	-	was class cance			7	0	1	0	0	2	29	4.81	. ,		4.75	4.67	4.67	4.81
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	l teac	ning effectiveness	11	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	438/1463	4.43	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.43
		Lecture																
	the instru	_	10	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	153/1438		4.55	4.46	4.43	4.93		
		tor seem intere	3	10	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.93	
		_		xplained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	291/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.77
		s contribute to			9	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	- ,		4.47	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did au	udiovisual	techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	14	2	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	363/1236	4.39	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.39
		Discuss				_			_	_	_							
				what you learned	27	0	1	0	3	3	5		856/1260			4.14	4.22	3.92
				d to participate	27	0	1	2	1	3	5		1054/1255		4.44	4.33	4.37	3.75
				d open discussion	27	0	1	1	4	1	5		1102/1258		4.42	4.38	4.42	3.67
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	stul		27	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	s 			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 22						quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	s 1	.5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	14
28-55																		
56-83							nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	19	Non-	major	25
84-150	84-150 11 3.00-3.49 6 D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				7	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	it	

Other

1

I

0

0

Course-Section: PSYC 382 1 University of Maryland Page 1286 Title Child/Adol Psychopathl Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Dahlquist,Lynnd Fall 2009

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 31

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncie	g		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	184/1509	4.87	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	234/1509	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	250/1287	4.77	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	7	18	4.26	587/1406	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	7	17	4.23	649/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	25	4.71	233/1489	4.71	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	233/1506	4.97	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	118/1463	4.81	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	215/1421	4.97	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	180/1411	4.87	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	69/1405	4.97	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	93/1236	4.83	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s 1	.4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	23

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	8
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Health Psychology Anderson,Robert Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 57 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1287 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	ane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	48	4.82	227/1509	4.82	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	13	44	4.77	234/1509	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	48	4.79	229/1287	4.79	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	7	13	29	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	8	44	4.63	253/1406	4.63	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	9	13	31	4.27	609/1384	4.27	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	10	17	22	3.91	1094/1489	3.91	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	3	51	4.94	350/1506	4.94		4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	12	43	4.72	177/1463	4.72	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.72
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	52	4.93	175/1438	4.93	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	56	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	10	46	4.82	222/1411	4.82	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	51	4.91	154/1405	4.91	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	2	1	8	14	16	4.00	664/1236		4.22	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	301/1260	4.68	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	0	0	4	23	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	189/1258	4.93	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	29	13	1	4	2	2	6	3.53	694/ 873	3.53	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.53
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
* * *														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Title Health Psychology Instructor: Anderson, Robert

Instructor: Ande Enrollment: 69 Questionnaires: 57 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1287 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	21	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	25
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		-	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 26

Community Psychology Brodsky,Anne E

Page 1288 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	1	6	15	4.28	852/1509	4.28	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	13	4.32	785/1509	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	554/1287	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	14	4.28	737/1459	4.28	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	6	15	4.24	611/1406	4.24	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	3	8	11	3.96	859/1384	3.96	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	3	4	15	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	23	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	3	7	8	3.95	918/1463	3.95	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture		_	_			_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	1		4.78	396/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	0	22	4.83	742/1421	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0			4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	499/1405	4.64	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	620/1236	4.09	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	316/1260	4.65	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	4		4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	0	2	16	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	5	3	10	4.11	417/ 873	4.11	4.00		4.08	4.11
i. Here special committees successful	ŭ	-	_	ŭ					11., 0.3		1.00	1.05	1.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar		_	_											
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.07	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	J. J.	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3 67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	0.07	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
5. 214 conferences help you carry out freta accivities	23	J	_	5	J	J	۷	3.07	, 11			1.52	1.10	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Title Community Psychology

Instructor: Brodsky, Anne E

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1288 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland

Special Topics In Psyc Baltimore County Freiberg, Karen

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment: 46 Ouestionnaires: 27

Title

Instructor:

Page 1289 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	_	•	_			_			044/4500	4 50	4 00	4 0 4		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	1	23	4.80	244/1509	4.70	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.80
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	3	0	0	2 0	0 1	6 4	16 19	4.50 4.75	543/1509 261/1287	4.55 4.55	4.30 4.27	4.26 4.30	4.25 4.33	4.50 4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3 3	1	1	0	1	5	16	4.75	432/1459	4.55	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	200/1406	4.58	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	7	14	4.29	579/1384	4.32	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	1	18	4.57	387/1489	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	4	14	5		1368/1506	4.59	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	325/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	725/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	1	21	4.83	742/1421	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	592/1411	4.68	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	540/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32		4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	2	1	18	4.52	261/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	574/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	287/1255	4.37	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	363/1258	4.57	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	283/ 873	4.43	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.36
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
midd mada														
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
									,					
Self Paced					_			- 0-				4 0.5	- 06	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 49	***	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	3	3.00	****/ 46 ****/ 37	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37 ****/ 30	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	4	U	U	U	0	2	5.00	/ 30			4.27	5.00	

Title Special Topics In Psyc

Instructor: Freiberg, Karen

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1289 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 393 2 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

Special Topics In Psyc Instructor: Rowland,Laura M Fall 2009

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1290

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			-		uencies			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	1	2	18	4.81	244/1509	4.70	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	245/1509	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	127/1287	4.55	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	227/1459	4.54	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	423/1406	4.58	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	107/1384	4.32	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	121/1489	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	682/1506	4.59	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	424/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	131/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	537/1421	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	429/1411	4.68	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	228/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	193/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	Ω	Ο	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	749/1255	4.37	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	818/1258	4.57	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	0	1	1	1		****/ 873		4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits E	Credits Earned C			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 393 3 Title

Special Topics In Psyc

Instructor: Rosen,Theodore

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1291 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	598/1509	4.70	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	731/1509	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	924/1287	4.55	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.54	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	253/1406	4.58	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	978/1384	4.32	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	630/1489	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506	4.59	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	628/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1060/1421	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.68	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	345/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	489/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	558/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	904/1255	4.37	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.57	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.43	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.50

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

Course-Section: PSYC 405 1

Hist & Systems Of Psyc Bediako,Shawn M Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1292 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4 05	010/1500	4 05	4 20	4 21	4 20	4 05
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0 1	0	T	0	12	4.85 4.46	210/1509 605/1509	4.85 4.46	4.38	4.31	4.39 4.26	4.85 4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	72/1406	4.92	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	385/1384	4.46	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	865/1489	4.15	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	7	1		1483/1506		4.75	4.67	4.67	3.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	301/1463		4.16	4.09	4.18	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	265/1260	4.73	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1255	4.73	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.91	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	139/ 873	4.70	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.64	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.32	****

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

Course-Section: PSYC 406 1 University of Maryland Title Adv Behavior Pathology Baltimore County

Instructor: Murphy,Christop

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 19

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1293

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	Λ	Λ	2	5	11	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	472/1287	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	726/1459	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	261/1406	4.61	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	55/1489	4.94	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	981/1506	4.61	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1411	4.78	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	526/1405	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	223/1236	4.59	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	487/1260	4.43	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1258	4.17	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.26	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	_			Dos	2000				Tr. n				Majawa	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons				Type 				Majors 		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	15		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4		
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough					
				P	0			responses to	responses to be sign:				
				I	0	Other	0	_					
				?	0								

Course-Section: PSYC 407 1 University of Maryland Title Adv Child Psychology Baltimore County

Title Adv Child Psychology Baltimore Count Instructor: Goldstein, Robin Fall 2009

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1294

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1287	4.83	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	182/1459	4.76	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	682/1506	4.85	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	603/1438	4.65	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	920/1236	3.64	4.22	4.00	4.03	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	333/1255	4.76	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.42	4.38	4.51	5.00	

#### Frequency Distribution

5 5 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 235/873 4.45 4.00 4.03 4.26 4.45

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	are not enoug	h	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 409 1 University of Maryland Page 1295
Title Development And Educat Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Sonnenschein, Su

Instructor: Sonnensch
Enrollment: 16

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies			s			ructor	Course	_	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 f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	987/1509	4.15	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.15	
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1034/1509	4.08	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.08	
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	658/1287	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.38	
4. Did other evalua			0	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	924/1459	4.08	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.08	
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	462/1406	4.38	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.38	
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	767/1384	4.08	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained				0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1082/1489	3.92	4.30	4.17	4.18	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled				0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1273/1506	4.23	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	1	9	0	3.90	983/1463	3.90	4.16	4.09	4.18	3.90	
Lecture																	
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	l prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1032/1438	4.31	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.31	
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	979/1421	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	964/1411	4.15	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.15	
4. Did the lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	526/1405	4.62	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	920/1236	3.64	4.22	4.00	4.03	3.64	
	Discussion																
1. Did class discus		what you learned	1	0	Ο	Ο	1	3	8	4.58	364/1260	4.58	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.58	
2. Were all student		-	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.75	
			1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	421/1258		4.42	4.38	4.51	4.75	
	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful			2	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	762/ 873	3.30	4.00	4.03	4.26	3.30	
		Frequ	1encs	, Die	-rih	utio	n										
		riedo	aciicy	DID	-110	ac101											
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	les				ason	ıs			Type				Majors		

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

Course-Section: PSYC 437 1 University of Maryland Title Making A Difference Maton, Kenneth

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1296

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

-								-										
							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		Genera			0	0	0	0	0	2	1 2	4 01	225/1500	4 01	4 20	1 21	4 20	4 01
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	3 7	13 8	4.81	235/1509		4.38	4.31	4.39	4.81
		ctor make clear destions reflec			0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.44	652/1509 261/1287	4.44 4.75	4.30 4.27	4.26	4.26	4.44
		lestions reflect			1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.75	346/1459		4.27	4.22	4.38	4.75
					0	0	0	0	0	3	13				4.28			4.80
				what you learned to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.81	130/1406 103/1384			4.09	4.11	4.81
		_		-	0	0	0	2	2	<i>3</i> 5	13 7		,		4.12	4.11	4.23	
		g system clearly		ainea	0	0	0	0	0	5 8	8	4.06	944/1489		4.30	4.17	4.18	4.06
		was class cance			-	0	0	0	1	8 7	-		1070/1506		4.75	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How wo	ula you g	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	U	0	Т	7	7	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.40
		Lecture	е															
1. Were the	re the instructor's lectures well prepared  I the instructor seem interested in the subject.				0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	262/1438	4.88	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the	the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was le	lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	169/1411	4.88	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.88
4. Did the	the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.75
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:				0	5	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	ace dieci			what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.60
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	367/1255		4.44	4.33	4.46	4.73
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	363/1258		4.42	4.38	4.51	4.80
		echniques succe		ia open arbeablion	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	292/ 873		4.00	4.03	4.26	
		a .																
1		Semina			1	0	0	0	0	0	1 2	4 07	22/ 00	4 07	4 02	4 40	4 71	4 07
				e announced theme dividual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	33/ 89 29/ 92	4.87	4.83	4.49 4.54	4.71	4.87
					1	0	0	0	0		13	4.87			4.63		4.83	4.87
				what you learned	_	0	0	0	0	1	14		18/ 90		4.77	4.50	4.69	4.93
		ons contribute			1	0	0	0	1	1 6	14 8	4.93	10/ 92		4.87	4.38	4.64	4.93
5. were c	riteria i	for grading made	e crear	<u>c</u>	Τ	U	U	U	Т	ь	8	4.47	35/ 93	4.4/	4.03	4.06	4.32	4.47
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utior	1									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ty	ne			Majors			
																		, 
00-27	0	A 7		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	16		
28-55	0	В 6		_						_	3	, .	_			_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ge	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					уh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

0

1

0

Course-Section: PSYC 440 1 University of Maryland Page 1297 Title Seminar In Social Psyc Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Blass,Thomas

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							_							~			- 1	
	Question	ıs			NR	NA	fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	Genera																	
1. Did you gain new i	-				0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	563/1509			4.31		4.54
2. Did the instructor			_		0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	720/1509		4.30	4.26	4.26	4.38
3. Did the exam quest					0	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluati			_		0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readi	-		_		1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	81/1406		4.23	4.09	4.11	
6. Did written assign			_	learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	807/1384		4.12	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading sy			ained		1	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	583/1489		4.30	4.17	4.18	4.42
8. How many times was	class cand	elled			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grad	e the overa	ıll tead	ching effect	iveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	511/1463	4.36	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.36
	Lecture																	
1. Were the instructo	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	950/1438	4.38	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.38
2. Did the instructor				ect	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture materi					0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	665/1411		4.45	4.31	4.35	4.46
4. Did the lectures c	_		_	_	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1405		4.47	4.32	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual te			_		0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	121/1236			4.00		4.77
	Discus																	
1. Did class discussi			what was le	a a wa a d	3	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.40
			_			0	0	0	0	2	8	4.40	287/1255			4.14	4.46	4.40
2. Were all students					3			0	1	3			- ,		4.44			
3. Did the instructor			ia open aisc	cussion	3	0 2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50 4.63	620/1258 169/ 873			4.38	4.51 4.26	4.50
4. were special techn	Were special techniques successful					2	U	U	1	1	ь	4.63	169/ 8/3	4.63	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.63
							trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
	0 0.00-0.99 0 A					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijor	s	9	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	12
	1.00-1.99	-1.99 0 B 5					nera	,				1	IInder-a		3	Mar	-maior	1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	9	 Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0	General					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: PSYC 463 1 University of Maryland Page 1298 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Eating: Normal/Abnorma

Warwick forsyth Instructor:

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	447/1509	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	434/1406	4.42	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1006/1506	4.58	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	804/1463	4.09	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	607/1236	4.11	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	681/1260	4.17	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	839/1255	4.17	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.26	****
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		 Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 `s	 7	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	10

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General 1		Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 601 1 University of Maryland Page 1299 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Special Topics In Psyc

Instructor: Baker,Linda

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	842/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1176/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	708/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	1044/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	885/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	886/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1295/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	9	1	3.67	1168/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	712/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	967/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	752/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	558/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	443/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	705/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	14	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	12	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	5	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 601 2 University of Maryland Title Special Topics In Psyc

Waldstein,Shari

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1300

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-										
			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	7	8	4.35	778/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1176/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	708/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	3	4.00	979/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	813/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	886/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1295/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	762/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	904/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	828/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	267/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	634/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	752/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	613/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	443/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	286/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	677/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.58
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	12	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	5	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Special Topics In Psyc

Title Instructor: Borrero, John C

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1301 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	244/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1013/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	882/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	454/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	349/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	597/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	325/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	675/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	496/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	540/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	322/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	352/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	665/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	901/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	771/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.25

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 4 University of Maryland Title Special Topics In Psyc

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Lasson, Elliot D

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1302

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1214/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	838/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	678/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	346/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	527/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	807/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	458/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	750/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1166/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	810/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1141/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1197/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	Λ	1	2	Δ	4.00	746/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	629/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	620/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	801/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.00
									,					

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

University of Maryland

Special Topics In Psyc Baltimore County

Title Fall 2009 Instructor: DeVries,A E

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1303 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eguer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
G1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	911/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	774/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	803/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1		4.22	803/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	-	4.11	729/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1		4.56	313/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	541/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	820/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	438/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.43
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	413/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.78	588/1421	4.27	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1411	4.31	4.45	4.73	4.78	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.76	587/1405	4.13	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	242/1236		4.22	4.00	3.98	4.56
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	U	U	U	U		2	O	1.50	242/1230	3.92	7.22	1.00	3.90	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	337/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	344/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	421/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	333/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar						_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
Galf. Parad														
Self Paced	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 40	++++	++++	1 20	1 10	++++
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8 8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37 ****/ 30	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	ŏ	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 30			4.27	4.26	

Title Special Topics In Psyc

Instructor: DeVries, A E

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1303 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Special Topics In Psyc

Title Instructor: Griffith, James

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1304 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1471/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	0	3.33	1419/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1186/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1254/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	1	3	2	3.00	1333/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1230/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.42
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	1	3	3	4	1		1399/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	5	2	0	2.80	1423/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	3	5	0	2.92	1416/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	2.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1099/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	1	6	0	2.83	1383/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	0	4	1	2.67	1381/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	3	0	3	2	3.00	1131/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1011/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	505/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.00

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 7 University of Maryland

0

0

0

0

Ι

Title Special Topics In Psyc Baltimore County Glasgow, Michael Instructor: Fall 2009

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

2

Grad.

3.50-4.00

Ctudont	Courac	Evaluation	Ougation	naira
Student	Course	Evaluation	Question.	naire

Page 1305

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

					- 1						ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	a gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	800/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.33
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1306/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.67
		uestions reflect			1	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1247/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	979/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	813/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	z expla	ined	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1236/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1354/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	3.20
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	3	3	4.50	800/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.50
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.83
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1051/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.00
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	634/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.50
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1236		4.22	4.00	3.98	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.75
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
		_	_	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful	-	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	***
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	rib	utio	n									
	_	_																
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	4	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	r r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

0

Title Special Topics In Psyc

Instructor: Milatzo, John P

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1306 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions N		3.7.7	Fre	equer 2	ncies	5	_		ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA			3	-4 	5 	Mean	Rank	mean	Mean	Mean	mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	516/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	828/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	708/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	227/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	287/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	182/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	986/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	896/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	438/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1047/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	713/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	974/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	664/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	Ο	6	5.00	1/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873		4.00	4.03	4.01	4.67
Seminar														
	_	0	0	^	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 89	****	4 02	4 40	4 20	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	, 05	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92 ****/ 90	****	4.63	4.54 4.50	4.52 4.48	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	4.77	4.38	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	ь	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 93		4.03	4.00	4.04	

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

Title Learning And Cognition

Instructor: Sigurdsson, Sigu

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1307 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	on Questi	ionnai	ire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	--------	-----

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions								Mean		Mean			Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	322/1509	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	911/1459	4.10	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	200/1406	4.70	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.67
Discussion	_	0	_	0	0			4 00	666 (1060	4 00	4 05	4 1 4	4 01	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	666/1260	4.20	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	Т	U	0	3	Т	5	4.22	350/ 873	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.11	***

Credits E	Credits Earned Cu			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	6	Non-major	10
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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PSYC 606 1 University of Maryland
Title Adult Psychopathology Baltimore County

Title Adult Psychopathology Baltimore County
Instructor: Murphy, Christop Fall 2009

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

estionnaires:	6	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
CDCIOIIIAII CD	9	Deadcire	COULDC	DValaacion	Queberonnari

			Fre	-	ncies	3			ructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	952/1509	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	683/1406	4.17	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	1203/1438	4.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7		1162/1421	4.50	4.80	4.73	4.49	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.45	4.73	4.78	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.50
5. Dia addiovibadi ecciniques emanec your anderseanding	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	3	3	1.50	27171250	1.30	1.22	1.00	3.70	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.50
Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Page 1308

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	4	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		Under-grad	4	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Title Data Analytic Proc I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 7

Pitts,Steven C

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1309 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies	3 4	_		ructor Rank	Course	_			
Questions		NA				<del>- 4</del>	5 	Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	меап
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.86	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	158/1509		4.30	4.26	4.25	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.86	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.28	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	971/1406	3.86	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	376/1489	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	896/1506	4.71	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	291/1438	4.86	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0			1	3	2	3.86	1166/1411	3.86	4.45	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1154/1405	3.86	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1246/1260	2.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	1230/1255	2.80	4.44	4.33	4.43	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1255/1258	2.00	4.42	4.38	4.50	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	73/ 184	4.33	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/ 198	4.83	4.69	4.22	4.31	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	36/ 184	4.83	4.62	4.48	4.11	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	5		65/ 177	4.67	4.68	4.36	4.41	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	4.60	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.04	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;

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

Title Data Analytic Proc. I

Pitts,Steven C 10 Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1310 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	_	ncies				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	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.27	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.83	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	90/1236	4.83	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1255	4.25	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1184/1258	3.33	4.42	4.38	4.50	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	***	4.00	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	44/ 184	4.60	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 198		4.69	4.22	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	150/ 184	4.20	4.62	4.48	4.11	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.68	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 165	4.80	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.80
- · · ·														

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

Course-Section: PSYC 615 1 Title

Meth Appl Behav An

Instructor: Deleon,Iser G

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1311 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.46	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	491/1287	4.54	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	313/1406	4.54	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	492/1384	4.36	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	330/1489	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	430/1438	4.77	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	482/1411	4.62	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	526/1405	4.62	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	489/1236	4.25	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	9	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	710/1258	4.42	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	738/ 873	3.40	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.40
	_	•	=	-		_	-		,					

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	12	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 620 1 University of Maryland Page 1312
Title Methods Of Assessment Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Methods Of Assessmer Schiffman, Jason

Instructor: Schiffma Enrollment: 6

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	-,	4.67	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.50
		uations reflect			2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.00
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	4.83
		-		o what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	619/1384		4.12	4.11	4.16	4.25
	-	g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	1	2	2		1155/1489	3.83	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.83
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506		4.75	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.40
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00	
3. Was led	cture mat	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.83		
4. Did the	e lecture	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.33	5.00		
5. Did aud	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	0	1	2	2	4.20	536/1236	4.20	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.83
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.83
		echniques succe			0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	292/ 873		4.00	4.03	4.01	4.33
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors		
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3							ed f	or Ma	jors	3	6	Graduat	е	5	Majo	r	6
28-55																		
56-83							nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	0
84-150																		
Grad.	Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0		Ot:	her					0							

Course-Section: PSYC 623 1 University of Maryland

Title Clinical Interventn II Baltimore County Instructor: Diclemente, Carl Fall 2009

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

	Evaluation	

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1313

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

		Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did oth 5. Did ass 6. Did wri 7. Was the 8. How man	e instructe exam que exam que exalusigned restten asse grading y times	Genera www insights, ski ctor make clear testions reflect actions reflect addings contrib signments contr system clearl was class canc grade the overa	the exp t the exp t the exp the exp ute to v ibute to y explant	pected goal expected goal pected goal what you lest what you ined	s ls s arned learned	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 1 2 0 0 1 0 0	0 1 4 2 0 1 3 0	1 1 0 4 1 5 0	4 3 2 3 5 0 1 0 6	4 3 0 0 3 2 0 9	2.25 3.11 4.22 3.11	1311/1384 1436/1489 1/1506	4.33 3.67 2.25 3.11 4.22 3.11 2.78 5.00 4.33	4.38 4.30 4.27 4.28 4.23 4.12 4.30 4.75 4.16	4.31 4.26 4.30 4.22 4.09 4.11 4.17 4.67 4.09	4.39 4.25 4.22 4.16 4.12 4.16 4.14 4.71 4.15	4.33 3.67 2.25 3.11 4.22 3.11 2.78 5.00 4.33
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participa 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss 4. Were special techniques successful						0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 1 0	2 0 4 3 3 2 0 1	7 9 5 4 7 9 8 3	4.78 5.00 4.56 4.44 4.25 4.78 5.00 4.89 4.29	1/1421 556/1411 708/1405 489/1236	4.78 5.00 4.56 4.44 4.25 4.78 5.00 4.89 4.29	4.55 4.80 4.45 4.47 4.22 4.25 4.44 4.42 4.00	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32 4.00 4.14 4.33 4.38 4.03	4.49 4.78 4.33 4.33 3.98 4.21 4.43 4.50 4.01	4.78 5.00 4.56 4.44 4.25 4.78 5.00 4.89 4.29
i. Weie be	cciai cc	emiiques succe	bbrur		_		_	Ü	Ü	_	5	3	1.25	317, 073	1.25	1.00	1.05	1.01	1.27
Credits Ea									ution Rea	n asons	q			Тур	ne.			Majors	
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grad           00-27         1         0.00-0.99         0         A         5           28-55         0         1.00-1.99         0         B         3           56-83         0         2.00-2.99         0         C         0           84-150         0         3.00-3.49         0         D         0           Grad.         3         3.50-4.00         1         F         0           I         0         ?         0					5 3 0 0 0 0		Ge:	quire quire neral ectiv	 ed fo				9 0 0	Graduate Under-gr #### - M response	ad Tad		Majo Non- are not	or major enoug	0

Title Community Psychology

Instructor: Brodsky, Anne E

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 8

ychology Baltimore County E Fall 2009

Page 1314 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	gain new	insights, ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.39	5.00
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	992/1509		4.30	4.26	4.25	4.13
		stions reflec	_	-	0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1287		4.27	4.30	4.22	****
		tions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	324/1459		4.28	4.22	4.16	4.63
				at you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	5.00
	_	-		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	589/1384		4.12	4.11	4.16	4.29
	-	system clearl		-	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	728/1489		4.30	4.17	4.14	4.29
		as class canc			1	0	0	0	0	4	3		1146/1506		4.75	4.67	4.71	4.43
	-			ng effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463		4.16	4.09	4.15	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instruct	tor's lecture	s well pr	epared	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	904/1438	4.43	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.43
2. Did the	instructo	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lec	ture mate	rial presente	d and exp	lained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	190/1411	4.86	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Did the	lectures	contribute t	o what yo	u learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.33	5.00
				r understanding	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	824/1236	3.80	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.80
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ss discus	at you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.25	4.14	4.21	5.00		
2. Were al	1 students	to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00		
					1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.86
4. Were sp	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss: Were special techniques successful						0	0	0	2	5	4.71	130/ 873	4.71	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.71
		Semina	r															
1. Were as	signed to	pics relevant	to the a	nnounced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****
				idual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.52	***
3. Did res	earch pro	jects contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.48	***
4. Did pre	sentations	s contribute	to what y	ou learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	***
5. Were cr	iteria for	r grading mad	e clear		7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.04	***
		Field																
				t you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48		****	4.39	4.36	***
_	_	_		tion criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48		****	4.41	4.40	****
		or available			7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47		****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what	degree co	ould you disc	uss your	evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ation	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	;			ТΣ	pe			Majors	}
00-27							 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	 5	Graduat	 .e	 7	Majo	 r	0
28-55	-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						_			-						3 -		
56-83	5-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						neral	_				0	Under-9	rad	1	Non-	major	8
84-150												0			.1			1-
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2			E⊥€	ectiv	res				2		Means t			_	ın
				P 0 I 0		Ot.ì	2022					1	respons	es to r	e sign	ıırıcan	. L	
				3 0		OCI	iet.					1						

Course-Section: PSYC 651 1 University of Maryland Page 1315 Title Cognitive Development Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Sonnenschein,Su

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	-	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Λ	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3 -	1	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	n	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	346/1459	4.60	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406		4.23	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4		107/1384	4.80	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	823/1489	4.20	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4		782/1506	4.80	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2		467/1463		4.16	4.09	4.15	4.40
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	O	U	U	U	5		1.10	107/1103	1.10	1.10	1.00	1.13	1.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	936/1236	3.60	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.25	4.14	4.21	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	_		,	5.00		4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	-	0	0	0	0	5	5.00 4.20	1/1255 850/1258	4.20	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00 4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.20	850/1258 114/ 873	4.20	4.42	4.38		
4. Were special techniques successful	0	Т	U	U	U	1	3	4./5	114/ 8/3	4./5	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.75
_														

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	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	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 655 1 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Adv Top A Behav An Instructor: Kahng, Sungwoo Fall 2009

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1316

MAR 22, 2010

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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	235/1509	4.82	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1509	4.82	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	130/1406	4.82	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	145/1489	4.82	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.56	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1288/1438	3.83	4.55	4.46	4.49	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	****	4.22	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.90	136/1260	4.90	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.90
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1255	4.90	4.44	4.14	4.43	4.90
	1	0	0	0	0		10	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.44	4.38	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	1	3 T0	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.40
1. Were special techniques successful		5	U	U		Τ	3	4.40	201/ 0/3	4.40	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.40

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	4	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	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	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 670 1
Title I/O Psychology
Instructor: Rosen, Theodore

26

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1317 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								equer		s			tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		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		m this course	0	0	2	1	3	11	3	3.60	1369/1509	3.60	4.38	4.31	4.39	3.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	3	6	8		1164/1509	3.90	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.90
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	739/1287	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.30
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.30
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	885/1406	3.94	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.94
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	886/1384	3.95	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.95
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	1058/1489	3.94	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.94
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	702/1506	4.84	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.84
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1117/1463	3.73	4.16	4.09	4.15	3.73
		Lectur																
			0	0	1	1	5	4	9		1235/1438	3.95	4.55	4.46	4.49	3.95		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea						0	0	0	3	17	4.85		4.85	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.85
					0	0	1	1	3	3	12	4.20	,	4.20	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.20
		es contribute t			0	0	2	3	2	3	10		1177/1405	3.80	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.80
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	784/1236	3.89	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.89
		Discus																
1 Did al	aga di aga			what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	****/1260	****	4.25	4.14	4.21	****
				d to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1255	****	4.44	4.33	4.43	****
		_	_	d open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1258	****	4.42	4.38	4.50	****
		echniques succe		a open arbeassion	17	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 873		4.00	4.03	4.01	****
1. Were b	special co	ciniiques succe	BBLUI		Ι,	U	U	O	O	_		1.07	7 073		1.00	1.05	1.01	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	son	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 12		Per	quire	 ad fo	 ъ М	 aior		9	Graduat	 1	. – – – – . 7	Majo		19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		1000	<u>1</u> u11 (	Ju I	) I 1·1	ajor	5	,	Graduat		. /	Maje	) <u> </u>	17
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				2	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001		-				_	011001 9		-	2,011		-
Grad.	17	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Otl	ner					5	-		3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 695 1 University of Maryland Page 1318 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Sem In Human Serv Psyc

Instructor: Diclemente, Carl

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	446/1509	4.78	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1020/1509	4.43	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1287	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	553/1459	4.65	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	246/1406	4.36	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	570/1384	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1219/1489	4.31	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1463	4.81	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1438	4.70	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1411	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	419/1405	4.81	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	536/1236	4.31	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	201/1260	4.21	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/1255	4.85	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.95	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.50

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

Sem In Human Serv Psyc

Instructor: Stapleton,Laura

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1319 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	=				•		•	_		4 00	405/4500	4 50	4 00	4 04		4 00
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.92 4.77	127/1509	4.78	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.92
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	•	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.43	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.77 4.92
		estions reflect ations reflect			1	0	0	0	0	T	11 11	4.92	114/1287 126/1459	4.71 4.65	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.92
				nat you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.85	753/1406		4.28	4.22	4.16 4.12	4.85
	-	-		-	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.08	96/1384		4.23	4.11	4.12	4.08
				what you learned	0	0 T	0	0	0	∠ 1	12	4.83	73/1489	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.83
		system clearly was class cance		iea	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.92	832/1506		4.75	4.17	4.14	4.92
	-			ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.77	114/1463		4.16	4.67	4.15	4.77
9. HOW WO	uia you g	rade the overa.	ii teach.	ing effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	2	9	4.82	114/1463	4.81	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.82
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	430/1438	4.70	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.77
2. Did the	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clearl				0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	291/1411	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.77
4. Did the	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1405	4.81	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.92
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	346/1236	4.31	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.42
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			nat you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1011/1260	4.21	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.60
				to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.85	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.80
				open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	4.95	4.42	4.38	4.50	5.00
		chniques succes		open alboabbion	8	2	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 873		4.00	4.03	4.01	****
		Semina																
1. Were a	ssigned t			announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****
1. 11010 0.	DDIJIIOU O	opios relevano	00 0110 .	amio ano ca circino		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 05		1.05	2.12	1.35	
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	guire	 ed fo	or Ma	ior		2	Graduat	 e	9	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1.0	-1		10		-	_	or adda c	-	-		_	Ŭ
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	13
84-150							a.	_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		-5
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				9	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
	-		=	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.	her					0					-	
				? 0								-						

Course-Section: PSYC 742 1 Title

Sem Child Health Psyc

Instructor: Dahlquist,Lynnd Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1320 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1509	4.78	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1406	4.89	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	541/1489	4.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1411	4.89	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	512/1236	4.22	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.89	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1258	4.78	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	405/ 873	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 89	4.80	4.83	4.49	4.39	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	63/ 92	4.40	4.63	4.54	4.52	4.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	50/ 90	4.60	4.77	4.50	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 92	4.80	4.87	4.38	4.30	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	71/ 93	3.60	4.03	4.06	4.04	3.60

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