

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | Katenkamp,Angel |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 140 |
| Questionnaires: | 56 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 29 | 4.29 | 919/1589 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 31 | 4.38 | 790/1589 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 31 | 4.49 | 613/1391 | 4.37 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.49 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 19 | 4.15 | 954/1552 | 4.04 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.15 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 33 | 4.26 | 693/1495 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.26 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 20 | 4.09 | 835/1457 | 3.86 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 4.09 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 37 | 4.47 | 540/1572 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.47 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 45 | 4.78 | 787/1589 | 4.66 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.78 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 16 | 4.20 | 766/1569 | 3.95 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 42 | 4.70 | 577/1530 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 40 | 4.70 | 1060/1533 | 4.68 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.70 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 40 | 4.70 | 419/1528 | 4.43 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 36 | 4.48 | 761/1529 | 4.24 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.48 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 39 | 4.63 | 251/1393 | 4.34 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.63 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 29 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 3.70 | 1051/1337 | 3.70 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.70 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 29 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 4.00 | 989/1331 | 4.01 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 13 | 4.26 | 884/1333 | 4.39 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.26 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 30 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 4.00 | 554/1014 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | Katenkamp,Angel |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 140 |
| Questionnaires: | 56 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 24 | 4.50 | 50/180 | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 23 | 4.50 | 59/194 | 4.50 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 4.53 | 96/178 | 4.53 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.57 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 20 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 4.17 | 136/181 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.54 | 4.17 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 20 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.34 | 66/165 | 4.34 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.37 | 4.34 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 52 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 50 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 51 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 51 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 53 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 53 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 53 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 01 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | Katenkamp,Angel |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 140 |
| Questionnaires: | 56 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 21 | 0.00-0.99 | 8 | A | 33 | Required for Majors | 20 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 5 | General | 26 | Under-grad | 56 | Non-major | 53 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 02 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | O'Brien,Eileen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 210 |
| Questionnaires: | 156 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|-----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 4 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 28 | 48 | 66 | 4.08 | 1131/1589 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.08 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 58 | 57 | 4.09 | 1103/1589 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.09 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 21 | 45 | 76 | 4.20 | 921/1391 | 4.37 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 38 | 3 | 3 | 26 | 42 | 39 | 3.98 | 1102/1552 | 4.04 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.98 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 38 | 81 | 4.36 | 587/1495 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 69 | 7 | 6 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 3.60 | 1232/1457 | 3.86 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 27 | 34 | 86 | 4.31 | 774/1572 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 118 | 4.78 | 787/1589 | 4.66 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.78 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 22 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 41 | 72 | 15 | 3.73 | 1225/1569 | 3.95 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.73 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 38 | 98 | 4.54 | 830/1530 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 33 | 110 | 4.66 | 1100/1533 | 4.68 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.66 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 62 | 69 | 4.32 | 922/1528 | 4.43 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.32 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 24 | 33 | 72 | 3.96 | 1204/1529 | 4.24 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 3.96 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 48 | 76 | 4.29 | 551/1393 | 4.34 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.29 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 26 | 27 | 31 | 3.62 | 1082/1337 | 3.70 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.62 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 56 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 21 | 27 | 40 | 3.92 | 1063/1331 | 4.01 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 3.92 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 56 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 56 | 4.31 | 846/1333 | 4.39 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.31 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 56 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 25 | 25 | 30 | 3.65 | 768/1014 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.65 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 02 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | O'Brien,Eileen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 210 |
| Questionnaires: | 156 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 128 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 4.28 | ****/180 | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 130 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 4.19 | ****/194 | 4.50 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 129 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 4.29 | ****/178 | 4.53 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 131 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 4.10 | ****/181 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 131 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4.37 | ****/165 | 4.34 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 140 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.30 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 140 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 140 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 140 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3.75 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 141 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3.75 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 145 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 145 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.27 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 144 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 145 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.83 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 143 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 140 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4.19 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 139 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4.19 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 142 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 02 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | O'Brien,Eileen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 210 |
| Questionnaires: | 156 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|-----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 142 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 143 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 4.09 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|----------------|
| 00-27 | 39 | 0.00-0.99 6 | A 66 | Required for Majors 42 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 7 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 54 | | Major 14 |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 5 | C 13 | General 62 | Under-grad 156 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 5 | D 2 | | Non-major 142 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 14 | F 0 | Electives 19 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 13 | |
| | | | ? 19 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 03 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | Ring,Brandon |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 208 |
| Questionnaires: | 122 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 9 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 31 | 59 | 4.27 | 938/1589 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.20 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 43 | 44 | 4.14 | 1053/1589 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.14 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 10 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 29 | 68 | 4.40 | 733/1391 | 4.37 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 10 | 27 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 33 | 32 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.04 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 11 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 24 | 63 | 4.37 | 575/1495 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.37 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 12 | 40 | 5 | 3 | 14 | 21 | 27 | 3.89 | 1015/1457 | 3.86 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 3.99 | 3.89 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 9 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 22 | 29 | 44 | 3.84 | 1233/1572 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.84 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 57 | 52 | 4.42 | 1193/1589 | 4.66 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 4.42 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 26 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 48 | 23 | 3.92 | 1056/1569 | 3.95 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.08 | 3.92 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 23 | 70 | 4.45 | 964/1530 | 4.56 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.45 | 4.45 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 24 | 81 | 4.69 | 1060/1533 | 4.68 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.69 | 4.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 13 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 35 | 55 | 4.28 | 974/1528 | 4.43 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.31 | 4.28 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 13 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 31 | 57 | 4.27 | 984/1529 | 4.24 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.31 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 14 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 35 | 46 | 4.10 | 743/1393 | 4.34 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.99 | 4.10 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 55 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 24 | 21 | 3.78 | 1009/1337 | 3.70 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 3.78 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 54 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 15 | 32 | 4.10 | 958/1331 | 4.01 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.10 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 47 | 4.61 | 603/1333 | 4.39 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.61 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 55 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 17 | 25 | 3.83 | 677/1014 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.83 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 100 03 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 208 | | | | |
|---|-----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|---------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Intro To Psychology | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 122 | | | | |
| Instructor: Ring,Brandon | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 103 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 4.28 | ****/180 | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.25 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 4.22 | ****/194 | 4.50 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.36 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 103 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 4.24 | ****/178 | 4.53 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.57 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 104 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3.64 | ****/181 | 4.17 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.54 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 104 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3.94 | ****/165 | 4.34 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.37 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 106 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.10 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.33 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 107 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3.43 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.13 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 107 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 106 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.61 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 106 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3.80 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 3.98 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 110 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.17 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 112 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3.30 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.11 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 112 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 3.86 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 112 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.81 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 113 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.57 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 109 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 3.52 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 109 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.17 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.23 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 109 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 100 03 |
| Title: | Intro To Psychology |
| Instructor: | Ring,Brandon |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 208 |
| Questionnaires: | 122 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|-----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 110 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3.27 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 110 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 33 | 0.00-0.99 10 | A 44 | Required for Majors 38 | Graduate 1 Major 3 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 43 | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 12 | General 49 | Under-grad 121 Non-major 119 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 9 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 6 | F 0 | Electives 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 5 | |
| | | | ? 22 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 200 01 |
| Title: | Child Developmental Psyc |
| Instructor: | Garrett,Adia J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 95 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 19 | 4.42 | 753/1589 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.42 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 18 | 4.34 | 840/1589 | 4.41 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.34 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 21 | 4.49 | 626/1391 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.49 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 22 | 4.51 | 498/1552 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.51 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 28 | 4.73 | 204/1495 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.73 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 19 | 4.35 | 569/1457 | 4.18 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.35 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 29 | 4.78 | 198/1572 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.78 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 4.97 | 140/1589 | 4.94 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 7 | 4.08 | 902/1569 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.08 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 25 | 4.59 | 759/1530 | 4.45 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 29 | 4.76 | 959/1533 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.76 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 25 | 4.65 | 509/1528 | 4.56 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.65 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 21 | 4.38 | 883/1529 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 4.00 | 796/1393 | 4.03 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 4.26 | 655/1337 | 4.20 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.26 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 4.68 | 457/1331 | 4.48 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.68 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 4.84 | 325/1333 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.84 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 20 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.47 | 263/1014 | 4.47 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 4.47 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 200 01 |
| Title: | Child Developmental Psyc |
| Instructor: | Garrett,Adia J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 95 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 29 | Required for Majors | 20 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 38 | Non-major | 25 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 200 02 |
| Title: | Child Developmental Psyc |
| Instructor: | Schultz,David A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 96 |
| Questionnaires: | 94 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 18 | 47 | 4.54 | 595/1589 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 50 | 4.55 | 555/1589 | 4.41 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 23 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 51 | 4.56 | 529/1391 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 23 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 30 | 4.35 | 744/1552 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.35 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 22 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 53 | 4.61 | 309/1495 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.61 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 23 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 4.43 | ****/1457 | 4.18 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 57 | 4.69 | 299/1572 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.69 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 58 | 4.84 | 624/1589 | 4.94 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.84 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 37 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 20 | 4.28 | 670/1569 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.28 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 51 | 4.70 | 577/1530 | 4.45 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 64 | 4.89 | 643/1533 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 53 | 4.67 | 479/1528 | 4.56 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 24 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 51 | 4.57 | 652/1529 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 26 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 52 | 4.60 | 266/1393 | 4.03 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 49 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 24 | 4.16 | 738/1337 | 4.20 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.16 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 49 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 23 | 4.16 | 909/1331 | 4.48 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.16 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 49 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 30 | 4.49 | 717/1333 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.49 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 49 | 28 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 3.41 | ****/1014 | 4.47 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 200 02 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 96 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Child Developmental Psyc | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 94 | | | | |
| Instructor: Schultz,David A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 85 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 86 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3.75 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 86 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 86 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 86 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 87 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 88 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 88 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 88 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 88 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 90 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 90 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 89 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 89 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 89 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 89 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 88 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 88 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 200 02 |
| Title: | Child Developmental Psyc |
| Instructor: | Schultz,David A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 96 |
| Questionnaires: | 94 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 88 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 88 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 1 | A 28 | Required for Majors 44 | Graduate 0 Major 29 |
| 28-55 | 9 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 27 | | |
| 56-83 | 10 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 7 | General 5 | Under-grad 94 Non-major 65 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 9 | D 2 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 14 | F 0 | Electives 10 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 7 | |
| | | | ? 30 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 200 03 |
| Title: | Child Developmental Psyc |
| Instructor: | Garrett,Adia J |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 96 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 4.11 | 1099/1589 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.11 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 7 | 4.33 | 853/1589 | 4.41 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 5 | 4.17 | 954/1391 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4.06 | 1037/1552 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.06 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 273/1495 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.64 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4.00 | 886/1457 | 4.18 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 4.50 | 495/1572 | 4.66 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.94 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 4.13 | 841/1569 | 4.16 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.13 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 4.06 | 1296/1530 | 4.45 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.06 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.56 | 1213/1533 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.56 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.38 | 856/1528 | 4.56 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 3.88 | 1269/1529 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3.50 | 1142/1393 | 4.03 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17 | 730/1337 | 4.20 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.17 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 543/1331 | 4.48 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 615/1333 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.60 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 200 03 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 96 |
| Title: Child Developmental Psyc | | Questionnaires: 18 |
| Instructor: Garrett,Adia J | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/1014 | 4.47 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 210 01 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Learning |
| Instructor: | Borrero,John C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 102 |
| Questionnaires: | 77 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 54 | 4.59 | 531/1589 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 57 | 4.70 | 367/1589 | 4.55 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 63 | 4.78 | 281/1391 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 33 | 4.53 | 488/1552 | 4.28 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4 | 12 | 14 | 32 | 3.64 | 1227/1495 | 3.83 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.64 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 40 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 4.19 | 741/1457 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.19 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 68 | 4.86 | 137/1572 | 4.83 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 44 | 4.58 | 1042/1589 | 4.57 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.58 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 39 | 4.61 | 288/1569 | 4.34 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.61 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 69 | 4.87 | 294/1530 | 4.88 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.87 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 70 | 4.92 | 469/1533 | 4.93 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 59 | 4.75 | 363/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 65 | 4.84 | 282/1529 | 4.79 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.84 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 53 | 4.58 | 282/1393 | 4.54 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.58 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 44 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 4.45 | 501/1337 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.45 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 45 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 21 | 4.41 | 715/1331 | 4.10 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.41 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 45 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 22 | 4.44 | 757/1333 | 4.19 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.44 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 45 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.64 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 210 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 102 |
| Title: Psychology Of Learning | | Questionnaires: 77 |
| Instructor: Borrero,John C | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 74 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 74 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 210 01 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Learning |
| Instructor: | Borrero,John C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 102 |
| Questionnaires: | 77 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 36 | Required for Majors 56 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 10 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 19 | | Major 40 |
| 56-83 | 10 | 2.00-2.99 8 | C 13 | General 5 | Under-grad 77 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 15 | D 0 | | Non-major 37 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 18 | F 0 | Electives 4 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 9 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 210 02 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Learning |
| Instructor: | Hausman,Nicole |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 100 |
| Questionnaires: | 47 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 24 | 4.40 | 780/1589 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 19 | 23 | 4.40 | 765/1589 | 4.55 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 22 | 4.18 | 946/1391 | 4.48 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.18 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 4.04 | 1059/1552 | 4.28 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.04 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 9 | 20 | 4.02 | 888/1495 | 3.83 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.02 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 4.06 | 854/1457 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 39 | 4.80 | 176/1572 | 4.83 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 26 | 4.57 | 1053/1589 | 4.57 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.57 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 11 | 4.08 | 902/1569 | 4.34 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.08 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 42 | 4.89 | 241/1530 | 4.88 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 43 | 4.93 | 410/1533 | 4.93 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 29 | 4.50 | 695/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 37 | 4.74 | 428/1529 | 4.79 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.74 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 29 | 4.50 | 349/1393 | 4.54 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 15 | 3.88 | 944/1337 | 4.16 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 3.79 | 1129/1331 | 4.10 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 3.79 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 3.94 | 1050/1333 | 4.19 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 3.94 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3.40 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 210 02 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Learning |
| Instructor: | Hausman,Nicole |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 100 |
| Questionnaires: | 47 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 40 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 41 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.50 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 39 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 39 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 39 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 39 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 39 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 39 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 39 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 39 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 40 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.14 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 41 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2.83 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 41 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 41 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.17 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 40 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 210 02 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Learning |
| Instructor: | Hausman,Nicole |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 100 |
| Questionnaires: | 47 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 27 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 1 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 3 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 47 | Non-major | 46 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 13 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 215 01 |
| Title: | Paraprofessional Res Com |
| Instructor: | Leisey, Kimberly |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 31 |
| Questionnaires: | 23 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 4.70 | 393/1589 | 4.81 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 4.41 | 765/1589 | 4.63 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.41 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 15 | 4.64 | 442/1391 | 4.75 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 4.52 | 488/1552 | 4.62 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.52 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 4.17 | 774/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.17 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 3.78 | 1104/1457 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.78 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 4.00 | 1095/1572 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 4.87 | 572/1589 | 4.92 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 369/1569 | 4.63 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 276/1530 | 4.94 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.98 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 322/1528 | 4.81 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.78 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 232/1529 | 4.86 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.13 | 720/1393 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.13 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | ****/1337 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | ****/1331 | 4.89 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | ****/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 215 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 31 |
| Title: Paraprofessional Res Com | | Questionnaires: 23 |
| Instructor: Leisey, Kimberly | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/1014 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 23 | Non-major | 20 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 215 02 |
| Title: | Paraprofessional Res Com |
| Instructor: | Leisey, Kimberly |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 33 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 125/1589 | 4.81 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.93 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 4.86 | 182/1589 | 4.63 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 25 | 4.86 | 204/1391 | 4.75 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 24 | 4.71 | 286/1552 | 4.62 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 4.68 | 246/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.68 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 21 | 4.71 | 200/1457 | 4.25 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.71 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 4.57 | 420/1572 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.57 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 4.96 | 187/1589 | 4.92 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.96 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.76 | 177/1569 | 4.63 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.76 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 4.94 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 4.96 | 235/1533 | 4.98 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 4.85 | 227/1528 | 4.81 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.85 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 4.85 | 257/1529 | 4.86 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.85 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 4.67 | 221/1393 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 238/1331 | 4.89 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 215 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 33 |
| Title: Paraprofessional Res Com | | Questionnaires: 28 |
| Instructor: Leisey, Kimberly | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1014 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 18 | Required for Majors | 24 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 4 |
| 28-55 | 5 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 28 | Non-major | 24 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 10 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 230 01 |
| Title: | Psychology And Culture |
| Instructor: | Talwar,Gitika |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 70 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 3.97 | 1226/1589 | 3.98 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.97 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 4.15 | 1044/1589 | 4.18 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.15 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 19 | 4.32 | 809/1391 | 4.27 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.32 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 10 | 4.09 | 1023/1552 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 16 | 4.32 | 620/1495 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.32 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 4.09 | 835/1457 | 3.99 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.09 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 16 | 4.26 | 829/1572 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.26 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4.97 | 140/1589 | 4.45 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.97 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 3.75 | 1209/1569 | 3.78 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 3.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 22 | 4.59 | 773/1530 | 4.52 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 28 | 4.76 | 942/1533 | 4.51 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.76 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 20 | 4.41 | 804/1528 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 21 | 4.38 | 872/1529 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 15 | 4.06 | 764/1393 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.06 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3.95 | 884/1337 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.95 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 4.05 | 973/1331 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.05 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 4.47 | 725/1333 | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.47 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 230 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 70 |
| Title: Psychology And Culture | | Questionnaires: 35 |
| Instructor: Talwar,Gitika | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.31 | 898/1014 | 3.55 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 3.31 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 22 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 22 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 16 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 2 | General | 7 | Under-grad | 35 | Non-major | 13 |
| 84-150 | 14 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 230 02 |
| Title: | Psychology And Culture |
| Instructor: | Tahseen,Madiha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 37 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4.00 | 1182/1589 | 3.98 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 4.21 | 985/1589 | 4.18 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.21 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 4.22 | 902/1391 | 4.27 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.22 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 4.15 | 965/1552 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.15 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 14 | 4.23 | 713/1495 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.23 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 11 | 3.89 | 1015/1457 | 3.99 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 3.89 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 4.15 | 968/1572 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.15 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 5 | 3.93 | 1536/1589 | 4.45 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 3.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 3.80 | 1170/1569 | 3.78 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 3.80 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 18 | 4.44 | 964/1530 | 4.52 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 4.26 | 1425/1533 | 4.51 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.26 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 15 | 4.30 | 957/1528 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.30 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 4.26 | 1003/1529 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.26 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4.17 | 674/1393 | 4.11 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 4.18 | 716/1337 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.18 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 4.29 | 802/1331 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.29 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 4.38 | 795/1333 | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.38 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3.79 | 695/1014 | 3.55 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 3.79 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 230 02 |
| Title: | Psychology And Culture |
| Instructor: | Tahseen,Madiha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 37 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 230 02 |
| Title: | Psychology And Culture |
| Instructor: | Tahseen,Madiha |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 37 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 3 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 20 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 285 01 |
| Title: | Abnormal Psychology |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Julie |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 90 |
| Questionnaires: | 62 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 49 | 4.76 | 316/1589 | 4.68 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.76 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 47 | 4.72 | 330/1589 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.72 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 40 | 4.56 | 529/1391 | 4.59 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.56 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 33 | 4.63 | 373/1552 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 39 | 4.57 | 351/1495 | 4.42 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.57 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 23 | 4.29 | 649/1457 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 48 | 4.74 | 255/1572 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.74 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 36 | 4.54 | 1074/1589 | 4.73 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.54 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 37 | 4.73 | 199/1569 | 4.43 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.73 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 48 | 4.74 | 505/1530 | 4.59 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 58 | 4.95 | 293/1533 | 4.89 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 50 | 4.77 | 322/1528 | 4.65 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.77 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 47 | 4.75 | 397/1529 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 42 | 4.60 | 266/1393 | 4.45 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 27 | 4.49 | 471/1337 | 3.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.49 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 29 | 4.53 | 599/1331 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 35 | 4.74 | 451/1333 | 4.22 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 4.74 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 27 | 4.46 | 263/1014 | 4.46 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 4.46 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 285 01 |
| Title: | Abnormal Psychology |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Julie |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 90 |
| Questionnaires: | 62 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 57 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 58 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 58 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 285 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 90 |
| Title: Abnormal Psychology | | Questionnaires: 62 |
| Instructor: Murphy,Julie | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | A | 36 | Required for Majors | 40 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 26 |
| 28-55 | 12 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 19 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 3 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 62 | Non-major | 36 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 285 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 90 |
| Title: Abnormal Psychology | | Questionnaires: 28 |
| Instructor: Resta,S P | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 4.61 | 519/1589 | 4.68 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.46 | 674/1589 | 4.59 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.46 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 4.61 | 482/1391 | 4.59 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.61 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 4.27 | 683/1495 | 4.42 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 4.04 | 860/1457 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | 4.04 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 4.31 | 774/1572 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4.92 | 373/1589 | 4.73 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 4.13 | 841/1569 | 4.43 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.13 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 18 | 4.43 | 990/1530 | 4.59 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 4.82 | 814/1533 | 4.89 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 4.54 | 657/1528 | 4.65 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 22 | 4.57 | 652/1529 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 4.30 | 551/1393 | 4.45 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 4.30 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3.14 | 1257/1337 | 3.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.14 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 3.92 | 1063/1331 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 3.92 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3.69 | 1180/1333 | 4.22 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 3.69 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/1014 | 4.46 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 285 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 90 |
| Title: | Abnormal Psychology | | Questionnaires: | 28 |
| Instructor: | Resta,S P | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.50 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.12 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.55 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.06 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 3.83 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.25 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.77 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 3.86 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 3.26 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.60 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.01 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 3.93 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.30 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 285 02 |
| Title: | Abnormal Psychology |
| Instructor: | Resta,S P |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 90 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.56 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 19 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 4 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 28 | Non-major | 18 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 292 01 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Forsyth,Zoe War |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1182/1589 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 853/1589 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1552 | **** | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.26 | **** |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | 1307/1495 | 3.50 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1457 | **** | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.14 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 495/1572 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 651/1589 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.63 | 4.83 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4.00 | 957/1569 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.12 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 644/1530 | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.47 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 924/1529 | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.39 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3.17 | 1280/1393 | 3.17 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.13 | 3.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.25 | 1230/1337 | 3.25 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 3.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 989/1331 | 4.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.75 | 1150/1333 | 3.75 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.39 | 3.75 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 292 01 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Forsyth,Zoe War |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 304 01 |
| Title: | Adolescent Psychology |
| Instructor: | O'Brien,Eileen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 53 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 4.27 | 948/1589 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.27 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 3.95 | 1105/1391 | 3.95 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.95 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 4.07 | 1030/1552 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 4.25 | 693/1495 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.25 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 9 | 4.15 | 786/1457 | 4.15 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.15 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 18 | 4.31 | 761/1572 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 4.93 | 373/1589 | 4.93 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 4.13 | 841/1569 | 4.13 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.13 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 19 | 4.63 | 711/1530 | 4.63 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 4.70 | 1047/1533 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.70 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 4.70 | 419/1528 | 4.70 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 4.44 | 806/1529 | 4.44 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 4.27 | 577/1393 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.27 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 4.33 | 601/1337 | 4.33 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 4.36 | 744/1331 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.36 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 4.50 | 702/1333 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 304 01 |
| Title: | Adolescent Psychology |
| Instructor: | O'Brien,Eileen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 53 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.18 | 444/1014 | 4.18 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.18 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 3 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 21 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 305 01 |
| Title: | The Exceptional Child |
| Instructor: | Morakinyo,Sue E |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 204/1589 | 4.86 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.86 | 1296/1589 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.86 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 340/1391 | 4.71 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 436/1552 | 4.57 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 255/1495 | 4.67 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 335/1457 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.57 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.14 | 968/1572 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.14 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 598/1589 | 4.86 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.86 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.83 | 1143/1569 | 3.83 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.86 | 1402/1530 | 3.86 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 3.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.29 | 1455/1528 | 3.29 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.29 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 652/1529 | 4.57 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.57 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.67 | 1057/1393 | 3.67 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.43 | 696/1331 | 4.43 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.14 | 952/1333 | 4.14 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.14 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 305 01 |
| Title: | The Exceptional Child |
| Instructor: | Morakinyo,Sue E |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 554/1014 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 307 01 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Aging |
| Instructor: | Else-Quest,Nico |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 75 |
| Questionnaires: | 37 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 27 | 4.65 | 463/1589 | 3.76 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 24 | 4.49 | 644/1589 | 3.58 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.49 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 21 | 4.35 | 780/1391 | 3.60 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 4.13 | 987/1552 | 3.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.13 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 4.43 | 508/1495 | 3.67 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/1457 | 2.86 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 30 | 4.81 | 176/1572 | 3.71 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.81 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 15 | 4.36 | 1249/1589 | 4.64 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.36 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 4.35 | 571/1569 | 3.36 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.35 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 4.73 | 541/1530 | 3.72 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.73 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 4.92 | 527/1533 | 4.60 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 4.86 | 216/1528 | 3.65 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 4.70 | 474/1529 | 3.63 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.70 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 23 | 4.31 | 532/1393 | 3.63 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.31 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 4.00 | 823/1337 | 3.42 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 4.44 | 678/1331 | 3.98 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.64 | 570/1333 | 4.06 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.64 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.27 | 908/1014 | 3.35 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.27 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 307 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 75 |
| Title: Psychology Of Aging | | Questionnaires: 37 |
| Instructor: Else-Quest,Nico | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 32 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 34 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 34 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 34 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 307 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 75 |
| Title: Psychology Of Aging | | Questionnaires: 37 |
| Instructor: Else-Quest,Nico | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 34 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 30 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 17 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 16 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 7 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 37 | Non-major | 20 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 1 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 307 02 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Aging |
| Instructor: | Kronheim,Steven |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 27 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 5 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2.86 | 1570/1589 | 3.76 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 2.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2.68 | 1570/1589 | 3.58 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 2.68 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2.85 | 1376/1391 | 3.60 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 2.85 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2.95 | 1523/1552 | 3.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 2.95 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2.91 | 1455/1495 | 3.67 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 2.91 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 2.86 | 1434/1457 | 2.86 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 2.86 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2.62 | 1546/1572 | 3.71 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 2.62 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 4.91 | 467/1589 | 4.64 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2.36 | 1557/1569 | 3.36 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 2.36 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2.71 | 1521/1530 | 3.72 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 2.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 4.29 | 1414/1533 | 4.60 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.29 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2.43 | 1518/1528 | 3.65 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 2.43 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.55 | 1513/1529 | 3.63 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 2.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 2.95 | 1323/1393 | 3.63 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 2.95 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2.84 | 1290/1337 | 3.42 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 2.84 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 3.53 | 1215/1331 | 3.98 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 3.47 | 1239/1333 | 4.06 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.47 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3.43 | 864/1014 | 3.35 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.43 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 307 02 |
| Title: | Psychology Of Aging |
| Instructor: | Kronheim,Steven |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 27 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 307 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 27 |
| Title: Psychology Of Aging | | Questionnaires: 27 |
| Instructor: Kronheim,Steven | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|----|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 3 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 16 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 12 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 317 01 |
| Title: | Cognitive Psychology |
| Instructor: | Gleiberman-Kowa |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 24 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 4.71 | 379/1589 | 4.64 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 4.67 | 400/1589 | 4.63 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 4.75 | 301/1391 | 4.73 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 4.70 | 309/1552 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.70 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 4.42 | 519/1495 | 4.49 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.42 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 4.30 | 629/1457 | 4.43 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 4.88 | 121/1572 | 4.81 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.88 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 4.87 | 572/1589 | 4.93 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 4.26 | 682/1569 | 4.32 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.26 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 4.96 | 112/1530 | 4.93 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.96 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.97 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 4.63 | 539/1528 | 4.71 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 4.58 | 639/1529 | 4.73 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 18 | 4.58 | 282/1393 | 4.60 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.58 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.28 | 647/1337 | 4.55 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.28 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.67 | 478/1331 | 4.72 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.61 | 603/1333 | 4.76 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.61 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3.80 | 686/1014 | 3.73 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.80 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 317 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 50 |
| Title: | Cognitive Psychology | | Questionnaires: | 24 |
| Instructor: | Gleiberman-Kowa | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 317 01 |
| Title: | Cognitive Psychology |
| Instructor: | Gleiberman-Kowa |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 50 |
| Questionnaires: | 24 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 317 02 |
| Title: | Cognitive Psychology |
| Instructor: | Alonso,Diane L |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 36 |
| Questionnaires: | 36 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 | 4.58 | 544/1589 | 4.64 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 21 | 4.60 | 467/1589 | 4.63 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 23 | 4.71 | 350/1391 | 4.73 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 4.64 | 362/1552 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.64 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 4.57 | 351/1495 | 4.49 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.57 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 20 | 4.55 | 354/1457 | 4.43 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.55 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 23 | 4.74 | 244/1572 | 4.81 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.74 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.93 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 4.37 | 546/1569 | 4.32 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.37 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 28 | 4.90 | 224/1530 | 4.93 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 4.94 | 410/1533 | 4.97 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 26 | 4.80 | 281/1528 | 4.71 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 4.87 | 232/1529 | 4.73 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.87 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 21 | 4.61 | 266/1393 | 4.60 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.61 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 4.82 | 218/1337 | 4.55 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.82 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 4.78 | 344/1331 | 4.72 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.78 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 4.91 | 227/1333 | 4.76 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.91 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3.67 | 756/1014 | 3.73 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 317 02 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 36 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Cognitive Psychology | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 36 | | | | |
| Instructor: Alonso,Diane L | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 33 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 317 02 |
| Title: | Cognitive Psychology |
| Instructor: | Alonso,Diane L |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 36 |
| Questionnaires: | 36 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 15 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 25 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 11 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 2 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 36 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 320 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 50 |
| Title: Psychological Assessment | | Questionnaires: 33 |
| Instructor: Anderson,Robert | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 4.19 | 1026/1589 | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 4.19 | 1015/1589 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.19 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 3.84 | 1176/1391 | 3.84 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.84 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 3.82 | 1251/1552 | 3.82 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.82 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 3.97 | 947/1495 | 3.97 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.97 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 3.52 | 1264/1457 | 3.52 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.52 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 3.90 | 1190/1572 | 3.90 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.90 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 4.25 | 1349/1589 | 4.25 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.25 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 16 | 4.28 | 670/1569 | 4.28 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.28 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 18 | 4.25 | 1169/1530 | 4.25 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 25 | 4.69 | 1073/1533 | 4.69 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 17 | 4.34 | 896/1528 | 4.34 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.34 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 20 | 4.44 | 818/1529 | 4.44 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 19 | 4.39 | 456/1393 | 4.39 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.39 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 4.11 | 774/1337 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.11 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 4.30 | 788/1331 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.30 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4.20 | 914/1333 | 4.20 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.20 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 320 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 50 |
| Title: Psychological Assessment | | Questionnaires: 33 |
| Instructor: Anderson,Robert | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.88 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 22 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 22 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 8 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 33 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 324 01 |
| Title: | Intro Interview Techn |
| Instructor: | Rudow,Edward |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 27 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 4.60 | 519/1589 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4.40 | 765/1589 | 4.40 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.39 | 693/1552 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 309/1495 | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.27 | 670/1457 | 4.27 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 4.70 | 290/1572 | 4.70 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.70 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 234/1589 | 4.95 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.95 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.55 | 336/1569 | 4.55 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.55 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.70 | 577/1530 | 4.70 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.80 | 872/1533 | 4.80 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 4.63 | 524/1528 | 4.63 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 4.60 | 615/1529 | 4.60 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.35 | 489/1393 | 4.35 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.35 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 4.69 | 323/1337 | 4.69 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.69 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.63 | 521/1331 | 4.63 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.63 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 361/1333 | 4.81 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.81 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 324 01 |
| Title: | Intro Interview Techn |
| Instructor: | Rudow,Edward |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 27 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 158/1014 | 4.71 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.71 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 11 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 330 01 |
| Title: | Child Devel And Culture |
| Instructor: | Watkins-Lewis,K |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 28 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 4.29 | 919/1589 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 4.21 | 921/1391 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.21 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 4.29 | 805/1552 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 4.00 | 899/1495 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 4.10 | 823/1457 | 4.10 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.10 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 4.05 | 1059/1572 | 4.05 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.05 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 4.59 | 1021/1589 | 4.59 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.59 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 3.62 | 1312/1569 | 3.62 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.62 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 4.26 | 1161/1530 | 4.26 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.26 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 4.63 | 1154/1533 | 4.63 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 4.14 | 1088/1528 | 4.14 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.14 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 3.96 | 1212/1529 | 3.96 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.96 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 16 | 4.52 | 332/1393 | 4.52 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.52 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 4.23 | 686/1337 | 4.23 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.23 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 4.64 | 510/1331 | 4.64 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.64 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 4.64 | 581/1333 | 4.64 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.64 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 4.00 | 554/1014 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 330 01 |
| Title: | Child Devel And Culture |
| Instructor: | Watkins-Lewis,K |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 28 |
| Questionnaires: | 27 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 17 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 18 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 01 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Sun,Shuyan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 64 |
| Questionnaires: | 42 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 20 | 4.19 | 1015/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 25 | 4.41 | 749/1589 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.41 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 19 | 4.26 | 865/1391 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.26 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 17 | 4.35 | 731/1552 | 4.10 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.35 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 3.36 | 1371/1495 | 3.79 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 9 | 4.08 | 835/1457 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 20 | 4.18 | 940/1572 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.18 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 36 | 4.92 | 373/1589 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 17 | 5 | 3.68 | 1270/1569 | 3.81 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.68 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 31 | 4.59 | 773/1530 | 4.54 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 32 | 4.71 | 1047/1533 | 4.61 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 19 | 4.03 | 1159/1528 | 3.99 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.03 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 23 | 4.18 | 1073/1529 | 4.13 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.18 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 3.86 | 938/1393 | 3.99 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.86 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 3.87 | 951/1337 | 3.76 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.87 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 3.63 | 1188/1331 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.63 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 13 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 12 | 3.69 | 1183/1333 | 3.86 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.69 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3.30 | ****/1014 | 3.60 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 01 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Sun,Shuyan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 64 |
| Questionnaires: | 42 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 33/180 | 4.32 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 4.67 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.33 | 81/194 | 4.30 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.33 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 70/178 | 4.38 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 61/181 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.64 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 28/165 | 4.20 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | 4.64 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 36 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 36 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/65 | 3.50 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 36 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/63 | 2.63 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 37 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 36 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 38 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 37 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 38 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 37 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 38 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 01 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Sun,Shuyan |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 64 |
| Questionnaires: | 42 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 39 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 38 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 19 | Required for Majors | 33 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 31 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 13 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 42 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 8 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 331 05 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 91 |
| Title: Experimental Psych I | | Questionnaires: 58 |
| Instructor: Barry,Robin A | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 36 | 4.46 | 713/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 46 | 4.70 | 356/1589 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 46 | 4.81 | 242/1391 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.81 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 28 | 4.59 | 425/1552 | 4.10 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.59 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 32 | 4.12 | 824/1495 | 3.79 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.12 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4.42 | 487/1457 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.42 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 43 | 4.65 | 339/1572 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.65 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 46 | 4.80 | 749/1589 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.80 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 15 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 19 | 15 | 4.12 | 866/1569 | 3.81 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.12 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 45 | 4.80 | 399/1530 | 4.54 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 40 | 4.61 | 1181/1533 | 4.61 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.61 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 37 | 4.55 | 632/1528 | 3.99 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 39 | 4.54 | 701/1529 | 4.13 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.54 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 28 | 4.39 | 445/1393 | 3.99 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.39 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 3.89 | 931/1337 | 3.76 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.89 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 20 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 21 | 4.21 | 853/1331 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.21 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 24 | 4.24 | 890/1333 | 3.86 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.24 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.00 | 554/1014 | 3.60 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 05 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 91 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I | | Questionnaires: | 58 |
| Instructor: | Barry,Robin A | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 4.81 | 21/180 | 4.32 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 4.81 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 37 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 4.67 | 40/194 | 4.30 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.67 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 37 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.67 | 77/178 | 4.38 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 37 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4.56 | 81/181 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.56 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 38 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.50 | ****/165 | 4.20 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/65 | 3.50 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/63 | 2.63 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 53 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 54 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 54 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 54 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 54 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 54 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 05 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Barry,Robin A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 91 |
| Questionnaires: | 58 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 54 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 54 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 30 | Required for Majors | 46 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 30 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 10 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 7 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 58 | Non-major | 28 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 15 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 09 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Michael, Kerry C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 36 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 3.67 | 1440/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 15 | 3.94 | 1232/1589 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.94 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 4.03 | 1049/1391 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.03 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 3.66 | 1357/1552 | 4.10 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.66 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 3.46 | 1332/1495 | 3.79 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 3.46 | 1285/1457 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.46 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 22 | 4.31 | 774/1572 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 4.75 | 825/1589 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 5 | 3.70 | 1249/1569 | 3.81 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.70 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 22 | 4.33 | 1095/1530 | 4.54 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 25 | 4.47 | 1287/1533 | 4.61 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.47 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 3.51 | 1406/1528 | 3.99 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.51 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 16 | 3.63 | 1381/1529 | 4.13 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.63 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 12 | 3.56 | 1110/1393 | 3.99 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.56 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 3.30 | 1218/1337 | 3.76 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.30 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 3.22 | 1261/1331 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.22 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 3.33 | 1271/1333 | 3.86 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.33 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 3.33 | 891/1014 | 3.60 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.33 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 331 09 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 45 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|---------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Experimental Psych I | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 36 | | | | |
| Instructor: Michael, Kerry C | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4.48 | 56/180 | 4.32 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 4.48 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 4.14 | 112/194 | 4.30 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.14 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4.20 | 130/178 | 4.38 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.71 | 44/181 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.71 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.33 | 68/165 | 4.20 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | 4.33 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 30 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.60 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 30 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | ****/65 | 3.50 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 30 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.50 | ****/63 | 2.63 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 30 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2.80 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 30 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.75 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 32 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 33 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 32 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 32 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 09 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Michael, Kerry C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 45 |
| Questionnaires: | 36 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 33 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 26 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 14 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 36 | Non-major | 10 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 331 13 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 39 |
| Title: Experimental Psych I | | Questionnaires: 31 |
| Instructor: Alonso,Diane L | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 17 | 4.19 | 1015/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.19 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 4.13 | 1072/1589 | 4.30 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 4.16 | 954/1391 | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.16 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 3.81 | 1268/1552 | 4.10 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.81 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 4.21 | 733/1495 | 3.79 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.21 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 4.03 | 867/1457 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.03 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 4.10 | 1005/1572 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.10 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 4.87 | 572/1589 | 4.83 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 3.76 | 1201/1569 | 3.81 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.76 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 4.43 | 977/1530 | 4.54 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 23 | 4.63 | 1140/1533 | 4.61 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 11 | 3.87 | 1277/1528 | 3.99 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.87 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 14 | 4.17 | 1081/1529 | 4.13 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 4.17 | 674/1393 | 3.99 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 4.00 | 823/1337 | 3.76 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 15 | 4.35 | 758/1331 | 3.85 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.17 | 933/1333 | 3.86 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.17 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3.46 | 843/1014 | 3.60 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.46 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 13 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Alonso,Diane L |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 39 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 3.32 | 170/180 | 4.32 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 3.32 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 4.04 | 120/194 | 4.30 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.04 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 3.96 | 150/178 | 4.38 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 3.96 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 3.73 | 165/181 | 4.41 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 3.73 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 3.64 | 132/165 | 4.20 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | 3.64 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.40 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3.50 | 57/65 | 3.50 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | 3.50 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.63 | 63/63 | 2.63 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | 2.63 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 24 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.20 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 27 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 26 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.33 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.50 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.80 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 27 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 331 13 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych I |
| Instructor: | Alonso,Diane L |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 39 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 27 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 27 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 23 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 24 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 6 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 31 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 8 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 01 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Pitts,Steven C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 61 |
| Questionnaires: | 44 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 28 | 4.61 | 519/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 29 | 4.54 | 569/1589 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.54 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 26 | 4.50 | 509/1552 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 3.34 | 1378/1495 | 3.59 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.34 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 25 | 4.48 | 432/1457 | 4.35 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.48 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 25 | 4.51 | 484/1572 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.51 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 32 | 4.78 | 787/1589 | 4.42 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.78 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 17 | 4.25 | 694/1569 | 3.89 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 34 | 4.89 | 241/1530 | 4.37 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 32 | 4.86 | 700/1533 | 4.57 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 23 | 4.42 | 804/1528 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.42 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 25 | 4.39 | 872/1529 | 3.99 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.39 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 9 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 4.07 | 758/1393 | 3.85 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.07 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 4.17 | 723/1337 | 3.97 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.17 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 4.17 | 890/1331 | 4.37 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.17 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 4.04 | 995/1333 | 4.42 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.04 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | ****/1014 | 3.59 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 01 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Pitts,Steven C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 61 |
| Questionnaires: | 44 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 50/180 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 23/194 | 3.68 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 4.83 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 93/178 | 4.06 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 40/181 | 3.73 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.75 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | ****/165 | 3.28 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 33 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 34 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 8 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 5 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 44 | Non-major | 10 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 12 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 9 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 05 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Julie |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 47 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 3.80 | 1358/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 10 | 3.90 | 1267/1589 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.90 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 3.77 | 1208/1391 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.77 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 4.07 | 1037/1552 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.07 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 3.69 | 1203/1495 | 3.59 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.69 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 4.00 | 886/1457 | 4.35 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 4.10 | 1005/1572 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.10 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 4.43 | 1183/1589 | 4.42 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.43 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 3.74 | 1225/1569 | 3.89 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.74 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 17 | 4.40 | 1016/1530 | 4.37 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 19 | 4.40 | 1350/1533 | 4.57 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.40 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 3.93 | 1229/1528 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.93 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 3.87 | 1275/1529 | 3.99 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.87 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 3.46 | 1168/1393 | 3.85 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.46 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 3.55 | 1123/1337 | 3.97 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.55 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 4.00 | 989/1331 | 4.37 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 4.09 | 980/1333 | 4.42 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.09 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 3.56 | 803/1014 | 3.59 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.56 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 332 05 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 47 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|---------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Experimental Psych II | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 30 | | | | |
| Instructor: Murphy,Julie | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3.60 | 155/180 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 3.60 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3.47 | 175/194 | 3.68 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.47 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 15 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3.86 | 158/178 | 4.06 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 3.86 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4.00 | 145/181 | 3.73 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.27 | 148/165 | 3.28 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | 3.27 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 05 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Julie |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 47 |
| Questionnaires: | 30 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 28 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 25 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 11 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 30 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 09 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Denenny,Daniell |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 22 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.56 | 582/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 4.22 | 975/1589 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 4.44 | 679/1391 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 4.61 | 394/1552 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3.71 | 1191/1495 | 3.59 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56 | 354/1457 | 4.35 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.56 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 4.11 | 995/1572 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.11 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4.67 | 956/1589 | 4.42 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 4.12 | 866/1569 | 3.89 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.12 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.59 | 773/1530 | 4.37 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 4.82 | 814/1533 | 4.57 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.41 | 804/1528 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.41 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 4.29 | 965/1529 | 3.99 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.31 | 532/1393 | 3.85 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.31 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.77 | 259/1337 | 3.97 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.77 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 4.37 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 325/1333 | 4.42 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.85 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.56 | 224/1014 | 3.59 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.56 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 09 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Denenny,Daniell |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 22 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 80/180 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.67 | 165/194 | 3.68 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 3.67 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 124/178 | 4.06 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 136/181 | 3.73 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 4.17 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.83 | 120/165 | 3.28 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | 3.83 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 09 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Denenny,Daniell |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 22 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 14 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 18 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 13 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Watkins-Lewis,K |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 3.55 | 1487/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.55 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3.64 | 1432/1589 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.64 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.18 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3.73 | 1320/1552 | 4.23 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.73 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3.64 | 1233/1495 | 3.59 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.64 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 557/1457 | 4.35 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.36 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.00 | 1095/1572 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3.82 | 1554/1589 | 4.42 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 3.82 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.44 | 1396/1569 | 3.89 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.44 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.60 | 1456/1530 | 4.37 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 3.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.18 | 1448/1533 | 4.57 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.18 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.10 | 1112/1528 | 4.22 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3.40 | 1429/1529 | 3.99 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.56 | 1115/1393 | 3.85 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.56 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.40 | 1181/1337 | 3.97 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4.30 | 788/1331 | 4.37 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.30 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 503/1333 | 4.42 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.70 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2.67 | 989/1014 | 3.59 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 2.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 332 13 |
| Title: | Experimental Psych II |
| Instructor: | Watkins-Lewis,K |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.75 | 180/180 | 3.80 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | 2.75 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.75 | 188/194 | 3.68 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | 2.75 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.50 | 168/178 | 4.06 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 181/181 | 3.73 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | 2.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.75 | 163/165 | 3.28 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | 2.75 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 332 13 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 13 |
| Title: Experimental Psych II | | Questionnaires: 12 |
| Instructor: Watkins-Lewis,K | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 333 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 60 |
| Title: Laughter And Humor | | Questionnaires: 60 |
| Instructor: Provine,Robert | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 31 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 3.52 | 1498/1589 | 3.52 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.52 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 31 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 9 | 3.55 | 1458/1589 | 3.55 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 31 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 3.72 | 1223/1391 | 3.72 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.72 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 31 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 3.59 | 1389/1552 | 3.59 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.59 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 31 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 4.21 | 744/1495 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.21 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 31 | 13 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3.19 | 1381/1457 | 3.19 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.19 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 32 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 4.07 | 1032/1572 | 4.07 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.07 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 4.93 | 373/1589 | 4.93 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 35 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 3.00 | 1508/1569 | 3.00 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 30 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 3.80 | 1420/1530 | 3.80 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 3.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 4.57 | 1213/1533 | 4.57 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.57 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 30 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 3.33 | 1446/1528 | 3.33 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.33 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 3.43 | 1422/1529 | 3.43 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.43 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 31 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 7 | 3.62 | 1078/1393 | 3.62 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.62 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 39 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3.33 | 1204/1337 | 3.33 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 39 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 3.52 | 1215/1331 | 3.52 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.52 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 39 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3.52 | 1226/1333 | 3.52 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.52 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 333 01 |
| Title: | Laughter And Humor |
| Instructor: | Provine,Robert |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 60 |
| Questionnaires: | 60 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 39 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2.86 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------------|-----------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | Graduate | Major |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C | 9 | General | Under-grad | Non-major |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | | |
| | | | | ? | 34 | | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 335 01 |
| Title: | Physiological Psychology |
| Instructor: | Forsyth,Zoe War |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 151 |
| Questionnaires: | 51 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 25 | 4.37 | 832/1589 | 4.43 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.37 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 21 | 4.17 | 1024/1589 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.17 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 20 | 4.18 | 946/1391 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.18 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 14 | 13 | 4.03 | 1066/1552 | 4.24 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.03 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 24 | 4.26 | 693/1495 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.26 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 17 | 9 | 3.68 | 1183/1457 | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.68 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 30 | 4.53 | 462/1572 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.53 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 42 | 4.95 | 234/1589 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.95 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 20 | 5 | 3.68 | 1263/1569 | 3.92 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.68 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 31 | 4.65 | 661/1530 | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.65 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 30 | 4.63 | 1154/1533 | 4.62 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 4.19 | 1050/1528 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.19 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 22 | 4.10 | 1133/1529 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.10 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 24 | 4.30 | 543/1393 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.30 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 37 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.50 | 1315/1337 | 3.27 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 2.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 37 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2.57 | 1318/1331 | 3.57 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 2.57 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 37 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2.57 | 1322/1333 | 3.69 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 2.57 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 335 01 |
| Title: | Physiological Psychology |
| Instructor: | Forsyth,Zoe War |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 151 |
| Questionnaires: | 51 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 37 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | 3.84 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 17 | Required for Majors | 34 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 24 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 20 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 6 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 51 | Non-major | 27 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 11 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 8 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 335 02 |
| Title: | Physiological Psychology |
| Instructor: | Turner,Nina L. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 36 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 18 | 4.50 | 646/1589 | 4.43 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 4.52 | 599/1589 | 4.35 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.52 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 4.25 | 874/1391 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 4.46 | 572/1552 | 4.24 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.46 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 4.68 | 246/1495 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.68 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 4.33 | 593/1457 | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 17 | 4.50 | 495/1572 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 12 | 4.39 | 1222/1589 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.39 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 4.15 | 816/1569 | 3.92 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.15 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 18 | 4.69 | 593/1530 | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 17 | 4.62 | 1167/1533 | 4.62 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.62 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 11 | 4.23 | 1009/1528 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.23 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 17 | 4.50 | 739/1529 | 4.30 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 4.19 | 640/1393 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.19 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 4.04 | 808/1337 | 3.27 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.04 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 18 | 4.58 | 567/1331 | 3.57 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 4.81 | 373/1333 | 3.69 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.81 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 3.84 | 668/1014 | 3.84 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.84 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 335 02 |
| Title: | Physiological Psychology |
| Instructor: | Turner,Nina L. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 36 |
| Questionnaires: | 28 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 21 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 18 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 28 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 10 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 340 01 |
| Title: | Social Psychology |
| Instructor: | Blass,Thomas |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 65 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 3.83 | 1338/1589 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 7 | 3.51 | 1468/1589 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.51 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 3.78 | 1201/1391 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.78 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 3.81 | 1259/1552 | 4.28 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.81 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 16 | 3.86 | 1057/1495 | 3.99 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.86 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 27 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.30 | 1353/1457 | 3.90 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 22 | 4.35 | 710/1572 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.35 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 10 | 4.22 | 1385/1589 | 4.63 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.22 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 12 | 1 | 3.28 | 1453/1569 | 3.84 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.28 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 19 | 4.14 | 1259/1530 | 4.50 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 29 | 4.67 | 1100/1533 | 4.73 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 13 | 3.74 | 1337/1528 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.74 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 4.00 | 1174/1529 | 4.47 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 8 | 3.81 | 965/1393 | 4.37 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.81 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3.47 | 1155/1337 | 3.61 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.47 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3.35 | 1243/1331 | 3.61 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.35 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 3.80 | 1124/1333 | 3.96 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.80 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 340 01 |
| Title: | Social Psychology |
| Instructor: | Blass,Thomas |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 65 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2.11 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 24 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 24 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 12 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 38 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 1 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 340 02 |
| Title: | Social Psychology |
| Instructor: | Resta,S P |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 70 |
| Questionnaires: | 67 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 41 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.69 | 393/1589 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 19 | 4.62 | 455/1589 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 4.76 | 291/1391 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.76 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 41 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 4.48 | 556/1552 | 4.28 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.48 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 41 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 4.19 | 754/1495 | 3.99 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.19 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 41 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 18 | 4.50 | 400/1457 | 3.90 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 42 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 4.56 | 430/1572 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.56 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 4.76 | 806/1589 | 4.63 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.76 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 46 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4.43 | 481/1569 | 3.84 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.43 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 41 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 4.69 | 593/1530 | 4.50 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 41 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 4.69 | 1060/1533 | 4.73 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 41 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.65 | 494/1528 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.65 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 41 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 20 | 4.58 | 652/1529 | 4.47 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 41 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 4.65 | 229/1393 | 4.37 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.65 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 60 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1337 | 3.61 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 60 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1331 | 3.61 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 60 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1333 | 3.96 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 340 02 |
| Title: | Social Psychology |
| Instructor: | Resta,S P |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 70 |
| Questionnaires: | 67 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 60 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 16 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 67 | Non-major | 57 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 45 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 340 03 |
| Title: | Social Psychology |
| Instructor: | Resta,S P |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 435/1589 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 614/1589 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.67 | 402/1391 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 467/1552 | 4.28 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3.90 | 1019/1495 | 3.99 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.90 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.91 | 998/1457 | 3.90 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.91 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 358/1572 | 4.52 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.64 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 467/1589 | 4.63 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.91 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 3.80 | 1170/1569 | 3.84 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.80 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 644/1530 | 4.50 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 786/1533 | 4.73 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 595/1528 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 282/1529 | 4.47 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 243/1393 | 4.37 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.64 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3.75 | 1021/1337 | 3.61 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.88 | 1093/1331 | 3.61 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.13 | 965/1333 | 3.96 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.13 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 340 03 |
| Title: | Social Psychology |
| Instructor: | Resta,S P |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 342 01 |
| Title: | Psych Of Aggression |
| Instructor: | Anderson,Robert |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 81 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 40 | 4.85 | 204/1589 | 4.38 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 30 | 4.57 | 511/1589 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 33 | 4.64 | 442/1391 | 4.25 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 23 | 4.33 | 756/1552 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 32 | 4.47 | 462/1495 | 4.03 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.47 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 17 | 3.84 | 1051/1457 | 3.87 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.84 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 20 | 4.04 | 1059/1572 | 3.88 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.04 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 37 | 4.79 | 768/1589 | 4.77 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.79 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 24 | 4.58 | 312/1569 | 3.88 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.58 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 36 | 4.74 | 505/1530 | 4.19 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 46 | 4.98 | 176/1533 | 4.56 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.98 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 35 | 4.70 | 419/1528 | 4.38 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.70 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 37 | 4.79 | 351/1529 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.79 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 28 | 4.53 | 324/1393 | 4.37 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.53 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4.35 | 587/1337 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.35 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.71 | 436/1331 | 4.41 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.71 | 503/1333 | 4.53 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.71 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 32 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | ****/1014 | 3.25 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 342 01 |
| Title: | Psych Of Aggression |
| Instructor: | Anderson,Robert |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 81 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 342 01 |
| Title: | Psych Of Aggression |
| Instructor: | Anderson,Robert |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 81 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 27 | Required for Majors 31 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 11 | | Major 27 |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 0 | General 3 | Under-grad 49 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 14 | D 0 | | Non-major 22 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 | Electives 8 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 6 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 342 02 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 30 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|-----------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Psych Of Aggression | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 23 | | | | |
| Instructor: Watkins-Lewis,K | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 3.90 | 1294/1589 | 4.38 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 3.81 | 1326/1589 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.81 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 3.86 | 1171/1391 | 4.25 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3.60 | 1251/1495 | 4.03 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 3.89 | 1006/1457 | 3.87 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.89 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 3.71 | 1307/1572 | 3.88 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.71 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4.75 | 825/1589 | 4.77 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.75 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 3.18 | 1481/1569 | 3.88 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.18 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 3.63 | 1451/1530 | 4.19 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 3.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4.15 | 1455/1533 | 4.56 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.15 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.06 | 1141/1528 | 4.38 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.06 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3.85 | 1282/1529 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.85 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4.21 | 620/1393 | 4.37 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.21 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.06 | 798/1337 | 4.21 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.06 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.12 | 948/1331 | 4.41 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.12 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 4.35 | 817/1333 | 4.53 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.35 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 342 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 30 |
| Title: Psych Of Aggression | | Questionnaires: 23 |
| Instructor: Watkins-Lewis,K | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3.25 | 911/1014 | 3.25 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.25 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 17 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 23 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 3 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 345 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 60 |
| Title: Intro Clinical Psych | | Questionnaires: 39 |
| Instructor: Deluty,Robert H | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 26 | 4.56 | 569/1589 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 19 | 4.28 | 912/1589 | 4.04 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.28 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 4.03 | 1049/1391 | 4.06 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.03 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 3.27 | 1492/1552 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.27 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 17 | 4.21 | 744/1495 | 4.30 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.21 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 26 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2.91 | 1430/1457 | 3.60 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 2.91 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 26 | 4.54 | 462/1572 | 4.10 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.54 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.75 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 3.92 | 1056/1569 | 3.85 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.92 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 33 | 4.82 | 364/1530 | 4.61 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.82 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 37 | 4.95 | 352/1533 | 4.92 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 24 | 4.38 | 843/1528 | 4.24 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 30 | 4.67 | 530/1529 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 19 | 4.24 | 603/1393 | 4.24 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.24 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 15 | 3.81 | 991/1337 | 4.13 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.81 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 4.08 | 964/1331 | 4.49 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.08 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 3.81 | 1124/1333 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.81 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | 4.40 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 345 01 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 60 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Intro Clinical Psych | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 39 | | | | |
| Instructor: Deluty,Robert H | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 345 01 |
| Title: | Intro Clinical Psych |
| Instructor: | Deluty,Robert H |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 60 |
| Questionnaires: | 39 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 23 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 31 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | B | 15 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 16 | General | 6 | Under-grad | 39 | Non-major | 8 |
| 84-150 | 14 | 3.00-3.49 | 12 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 9 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 345 02 |
| Title: | Intro Clinical Psych |
| Instructor: | Martinez,Marian |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1182/1589 | 4.28 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3.80 | 1326/1589 | 4.04 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.10 | 1005/1391 | 4.06 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 604/1552 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.40 | 531/1495 | 4.30 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 629/1457 | 3.60 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.67 | 1334/1572 | 4.10 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 1116/1589 | 4.75 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.78 | 1193/1569 | 3.85 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.78 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4.40 | 1016/1530 | 4.61 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 586/1533 | 4.92 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4.10 | 1112/1528 | 4.24 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.10 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4.40 | 852/1529 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 586/1393 | 4.24 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.44 | 510/1337 | 4.13 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.44 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 238/1331 | 4.49 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 277/1333 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.89 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 345 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 12 |
| Title: Intro Clinical Psych | | Questionnaires: 12 |
| Instructor: Martinez,Marian | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 293/1014 | 4.40 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.40 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 356 01 |
| Title: | Psyc Of Sex And Gender |
| Instructor: | O'Brien,Eileen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 65 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 17 | 22 | 3.95 | 1249/1589 | 3.95 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 28 | 4.11 | 1092/1589 | 4.11 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.11 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 18 | 3.59 | 1283/1391 | 3.59 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.59 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 27 | 4.05 | 1045/1552 | 4.05 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.05 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 24 | 4.02 | 893/1495 | 4.02 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.02 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 20 | 3.98 | 908/1457 | 3.98 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.98 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 12 | 20 | 3.77 | 1282/1572 | 3.77 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.77 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 47 | 4.79 | 768/1589 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.79 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 14 | 11 | 3.76 | 1201/1569 | 3.76 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.76 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 34 | 4.33 | 1107/1530 | 4.33 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 42 | 4.65 | 1127/1533 | 4.65 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.65 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 34 | 4.35 | 883/1528 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.35 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 15 | 29 | 4.19 | 1065/1529 | 4.19 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.19 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 23 | 3.94 | 865/1393 | 3.94 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.94 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 20 | 4.41 | 550/1337 | 4.41 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.41 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 25 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 23 | 4.53 | 599/1331 | 4.53 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 25 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 4.53 | 675/1333 | 4.53 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.53 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 25 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 3.66 | 762/1014 | 3.66 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.66 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 356 01 |
| Title: | Psyc Of Sex And Gender |
| Instructor: | O'Brien,Eileen |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 65 |
| Questionnaires: | 57 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 26 | Required for Majors 38 | Graduate 0 Major 31 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 19 | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 6 | C 4 | General 2 | Under-grad 57 Non-major 26 |
| 84-150 | 19 | 3.00-3.49 11 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 12 | F 0 | Electives 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 2 | |
| | | | ? 7 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 357 01 |
| Title: | Psyc Of Women |
| Instructor: | Else-Quest,Nico |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 66 |
| Questionnaires: | 41 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 27 | 4.46 | 699/1589 | 4.47 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 24 | 4.34 | 840/1589 | 4.45 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.34 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 22 | 4.24 | 883/1391 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.24 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 20 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 3.81 | 1268/1552 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.81 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 24 | 4.50 | 416/1495 | 4.51 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3.50 | 1268/1457 | 3.47 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 32 | 4.63 | 358/1572 | 4.72 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.63 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 4.63 | 983/1589 | 4.46 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.63 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 13 | 4.15 | 816/1569 | 4.21 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.15 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 34 | 4.83 | 364/1530 | 4.79 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 4.93 | 469/1533 | 4.79 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.93 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 32 | 4.73 | 377/1528 | 4.71 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.73 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 30 | 4.63 | 572/1529 | 4.68 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.63 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 27 | 4.50 | 349/1393 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3.78 | 1009/1337 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.78 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.47 | 650/1331 | 4.54 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 24 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.35 | 817/1333 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.35 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 357 01 |
| Title: | Psyc Of Women |
| Instructor: | Else-Quest,Nico |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 66 |
| Questionnaires: | 41 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 24 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.75 | ****/1014 | 3.39 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 17 | Required for Majors | 29 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 26 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 7 | C | 5 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 41 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 23 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 13 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 4 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 357 02 |
| Title: | Psyc Of Women |
| Instructor: | Turner,Nina L. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 42 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 23 | 4.49 | 672/1589 | 4.47 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.49 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 24 | 4.57 | 525/1589 | 4.45 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 25 | 4.57 | 529/1391 | 4.41 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 4.44 | 604/1552 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 24 | 4.51 | 405/1495 | 4.51 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.51 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3.44 | 1294/1457 | 3.47 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.44 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 4.81 | 168/1572 | 4.72 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.81 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 10 | 4.28 | 1331/1589 | 4.46 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.28 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 14 | 4.27 | 682/1569 | 4.21 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.27 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 28 | 4.76 | 488/1530 | 4.79 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.76 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 28 | 4.65 | 1127/1533 | 4.79 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.65 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 27 | 4.69 | 434/1528 | 4.71 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 31 | 4.73 | 443/1529 | 4.68 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.73 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 4.00 | 796/1393 | 4.25 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 20 | 4.44 | 510/1337 | 4.11 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.44 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 24 | 4.62 | 532/1331 | 4.54 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 27 | 4.65 | 570/1333 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.65 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 357 02 |
| Title: | Psyc Of Women |
| Instructor: | Turner,Nina L. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 42 |
| Questionnaires: | 38 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 3.39 | 877/1014 | 3.39 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.39 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 15 | Required for Majors 23 | Graduate 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 17 | | Major 29 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 1 | C 0 | General 3 | Under-grad 38 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 7 | D 0 | | Non-major 9 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 8 | F 0 | Electives 4 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 1 | |
| | | | ? 6 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 370 01 |
| Title: | Sensation And Perception |
| Instructor: | Provine,Robert |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 100 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 3 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 14 | 23 | 40 | 3.79 | 1364/1589 | 3.79 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 3.39 | 1499/1589 | 3.39 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.39 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 26 | 30 | 3.55 | 1290/1391 | 3.55 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.55 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 53 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 13 | 3.39 | 1473/1552 | 3.39 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.39 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 4 | 18 | 15 | 21 | 24 | 15 | 3.03 | 1434/1495 | 3.03 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.03 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 49 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 4 | 2.74 | 1443/1457 | 2.74 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 2.74 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 6 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 18 | 59 | 4.31 | 774/1572 | 4.31 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.31 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 94 | 4.98 | 140/1589 | 4.98 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.98 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 25 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 23 | 23 | 9 | 3.15 | 1486/1569 | 3.15 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.15 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 23 | 45 | 3.96 | 1352/1530 | 3.96 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 3.96 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 77 | 4.69 | 1060/1533 | 4.69 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 22 | 25 | 23 | 3.31 | 1450/1528 | 3.31 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.31 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 20 | 23 | 37 | 3.80 | 1317/1529 | 3.80 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 7 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 18 | 24 | 21 | 3.43 | 1184/1393 | 3.43 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.43 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 46 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 14 | 10 | 16 | 3.37 | 1191/1337 | 3.37 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.37 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 47 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 10 | 20 | 3.77 | 1133/1331 | 3.77 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.77 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 46 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 9 | 24 | 3.81 | 1118/1333 | 3.81 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.81 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 46 | 39 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2.27 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 370 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 141 |
| Title: | Sensation And Perception | | Questionnaires: | 100 |
| Instructor: | Provine,Robert | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 93 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.08 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 95 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.80 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 96 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 96 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 96 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 97 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.53 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 97 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 97 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 97 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.33 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 97 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 370 01 |
| Title: | Sensation And Perception |
| Instructor: | Provine,Robert |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Enrollment: | 141 |
| Questionnaires: | 100 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 97 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 98 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 32 | Required for Majors 70 | Graduate 0 Major 68 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 1 | B 33 | | |
| 56-83 | 10 | 2.00-2.99 10 | C 13 | General 3 | Under-grad 100 Non-major 32 |
| 84-150 | 26 | 3.00-3.49 16 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 16 | F 1 | Electives 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 1 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 3 | |
| | | | ? 15 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 382 01 |
| Title: | Child/Adol Psychopathlg |
| Instructor: | Dahlquist,Lynnd |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 61 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 39 | 4.79 | 265/1589 | 4.61 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.79 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 38 | 4.75 | 292/1589 | 4.57 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 33 | 4.60 | 482/1391 | 4.68 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 28 | 4.47 | 572/1552 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 29 | 4.44 | 496/1495 | 4.53 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.44 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 29 | 4.42 | 498/1457 | 4.42 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.42 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 38 | 4.77 | 210/1572 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.77 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 45 | 4.94 | 327/1589 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 35 | 4.81 | 149/1569 | 4.63 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.81 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 46 | 4.96 | 112/1530 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.96 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 46 | 4.96 | 293/1533 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.96 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 45 | 4.92 | 156/1528 | 4.61 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.92 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 45 | 4.94 | 136/1529 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.94 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 34 | 4.62 | 251/1393 | 4.60 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.62 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 4.65 | 351/1337 | 4.51 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.65 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 22 | 4.67 | 478/1331 | 4.68 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 23 | 4.67 | 547/1333 | 4.72 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 382 01 |
| Title: | Child/Adol Psychopathlgy |
| Instructor: | Dahlquist,Lynnd |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 61 |
| Questionnaires: | 49 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 20 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | 3.88 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 23 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 38 |
| 28-55 | 4 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 24 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C | 4 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 49 | Non-major | 11 |
| 84-150 | 18 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 15 | F | 0 | Electives | 12 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 382 02 |
| Title: | Child/Adol Psychopathlg |
| Instructor: | Goldstein,Robin |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 14 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.43 | 753/1589 | 4.61 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.38 | 790/1589 | 4.57 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 301/1391 | 4.68 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.15 | 954/1552 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.15 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.62 | 300/1495 | 4.53 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.62 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4.43 | 487/1457 | 4.42 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3.79 | 1272/1572 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.79 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.45 | 439/1569 | 4.63 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.45 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.00 | 1319/1530 | 4.48 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4.77 | 942/1533 | 4.86 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.77 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.31 | 949/1528 | 4.61 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.31 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.38 | 872/1529 | 4.66 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.58 | 282/1393 | 4.60 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.58 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4.38 | 564/1337 | 4.51 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.38 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.69 | 446/1331 | 4.68 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.77 | 425/1333 | 4.72 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.77 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 382 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 14 |
| Title: Child/Adol Psychopathlgy | | Questionnaires: 14 |
| Instructor: Goldstein,Robin | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.88 | 654/1014 | 3.88 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 3.88 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|---------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 3 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 5 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 385 01 |
| Title: | Health Psychology |
| Instructor: | Beatty,Danielle |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 66 |
| Questionnaires: | 51 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 3.31 | 1538/1589 | 3.96 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 3.31 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 3.06 | 1553/1589 | 3.84 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 3.06 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 3.12 | 1355/1391 | 3.85 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 3.12 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 14 | 3.45 | 1445/1552 | 3.89 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 3.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 22 | 16 | 3.98 | 923/1495 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.98 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 3.20 | 1376/1457 | 3.70 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 3.20 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 17 | 3.80 | 1262/1572 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 3.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 38 | 4.70 | 920/1589 | 4.58 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.70 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 16 | 13 | 3.61 | 1319/1569 | 4.07 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.61 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 3.33 | 1490/1530 | 3.96 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 3.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 30 | 4.32 | 1395/1533 | 4.53 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.32 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 22 | 9 | 3.43 | 1425/1528 | 4.04 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 3.43 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 3.20 | 1468/1529 | 3.94 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 3.20 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 14 | 3.55 | 1115/1393 | 3.88 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 3.55 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 28 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 3.30 | 1215/1337 | 3.94 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 3.30 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 28 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 3.91 | 1072/1331 | 4.22 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.91 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 28 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 3.96 | 1038/1333 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.96 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 28 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2.94 | 959/1014 | 3.57 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 2.94 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 385 01 |
| Title: | Health Psychology |
| Instructor: | Beatty,Danielle |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 66 |
| Questionnaires: | 51 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.31 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.94 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.58 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 5.00 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.15 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.25 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.25 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 5.00 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 385 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 66 |
| Title: Health Psychology | | Questionnaires: 51 |
| Instructor: Beatty,Danielle | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 20 | Required for Majors | 28 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 16 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 5 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 51 | Non-major | 31 |
| 84-150 | 15 | 3.00-3.49 | 12 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 9 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 385 02 |
| Title: | Health Psychology |
| Instructor: | Turner,Nina L. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 32 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 4.62 | 505/1589 | 3.96 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.62 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 19 | 4.62 | 455/1589 | 3.84 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.62 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 4.58 | 517/1391 | 3.85 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 14 | 4.33 | 756/1552 | 3.89 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 4.73 | 197/1495 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.73 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 4.19 | 741/1457 | 3.70 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | 4.19 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 4.77 | 221/1572 | 4.28 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.77 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 4.46 | 1154/1589 | 4.58 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 4.46 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 4.54 | 336/1569 | 4.07 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.54 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 19 | 4.58 | 787/1530 | 3.96 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.58 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 4.73 | 994/1533 | 4.53 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.73 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 4.64 | 509/1528 | 4.04 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 4.68 | 502/1529 | 3.94 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.68 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 4.21 | 629/1393 | 3.88 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.21 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 4.57 | 400/1337 | 3.94 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.57 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 4.52 | 607/1331 | 4.22 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.52 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.62 | 603/1333 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.62 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.20 | 429/1014 | 3.57 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | 4.20 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 385 02 |
| Title: | Health Psychology |
| Instructor: | Turner,Nina L. |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 32 |
| Questionnaires: | 31 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 5.00 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|------------|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 19 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 31 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 7 | | | | | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 390 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 62 |
| Title: Neuropsychopharmacology | | Questionnaires: 35 |
| Instructor: Rabin,B M | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|----|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 23 | 4.53 | 620/1589 | 4.53 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 11 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 4.09 | 1016/1391 | 4.09 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.09 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.13 | ****/1552 | **** | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | **** |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 13 | 3.89 | 1028/1495 | 3.89 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 3.89 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1457 | **** | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 20 | 4.29 | 787/1572 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.29 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 3 | 11 | 3.53 | 1571/1589 | 3.53 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 3.53 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 3.78 | 1185/1569 | 3.78 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 3.78 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 20 | 4.59 | 773/1530 | 4.59 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.59 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 26 | 4.68 | 1087/1533 | 4.68 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.68 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 17 | 4.26 | 983/1528 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.26 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 21 | 4.50 | 739/1529 | 4.50 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 17 | 4.23 | 603/1393 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.23 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2.62 | 1312/1337 | 2.62 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 2.62 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 3.20 | 1264/1331 | 3.20 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 3.20 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 3.25 | 1284/1333 | 3.25 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 3.25 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 390 01 |
| Title: | Neuropsychopharmacology |
| Instructor: | Rabin,B M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 62 |
| Questionnaires: | 35 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 33 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.05 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 33 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 34 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.16 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 33 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.49 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 23 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 9 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 35 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 1 | Electives | 4 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 6 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 393 03 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Rudow,Edward |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 22 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 435/1589 | 4.67 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 400/1589 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 402/1391 | 4.67 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 509/1552 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.24 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 416/1495 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.11 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/1457 | **** | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.13 | **** |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 735/1572 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.18 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 288/1569 | 4.60 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.10 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 346/1530 | 4.83 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.49 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 786/1533 | 4.83 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.83 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 479/1528 | 4.67 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 282/1529 | 4.83 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.34 | 4.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 111/1393 | 4.83 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.10 | 4.83 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 379/1337 | 4.60 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.20 | 4.60 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | 861/1331 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 615/1333 | 4.60 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.60 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 393 03 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 22 |
| Title: Special Topics In Psych | | Questionnaires: 20 |
| Instructor: Rudow,Edward | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.04 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---|------|--|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 5 Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate 1 Major 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 0 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 General | 4 | Under-grad 19 Non-major 17 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 0 Electives P 0 I 0 Other | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | ? 15 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 400 01 |
| Title: | Sem In Developmentl Psyc |
| Instructor: | Schultz,David A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 8 | 4.26 | 948/1589 | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.26 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.16 | 1044/1589 | 4.16 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.16 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 4.26 | 837/1552 | 4.26 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.26 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.53 | 394/1495 | 4.53 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.53 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 4.37 | 557/1457 | 4.37 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.37 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.47 | 540/1572 | 4.47 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.47 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 4.89 | 493/1589 | 4.89 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.18 | 791/1569 | 4.18 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.18 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 4.63 | 694/1530 | 4.63 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.79 | 907/1533 | 4.79 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.79 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 4.58 | 607/1528 | 4.58 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.58 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.37 | 893/1529 | 4.37 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.37 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4.50 | 349/1393 | 4.50 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.47 | 481/1337 | 4.47 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.47 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.71 | 436/1331 | 4.71 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82 | 349/1333 | 4.82 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.82 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 400 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 24 |
| Title: Sem In Developmentl Psyc | | Questionnaires: 19 |
| Instructor: Schultz,David A | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 395/1014 | 4.25 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 4.25 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 3 | Required for Majors | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 10 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 2 | General | 2 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 6 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 3 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 |
| | | | ? 3 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 405 01 |
| Title: | Hist & Systems Of Psyc |
| Instructor: | Kronheim,Steven |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 6 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1182/1589 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 1326/1589 | 3.80 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 3.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 733/1391 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.20 | 744/1495 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3.40 | 1312/1457 | 3.40 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.40 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 388/1572 | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | 1416/1569 | 3.40 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 3.40 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 1209/1530 | 4.20 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.20 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 872/1533 | 4.80 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1433/1528 | 3.40 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 3.40 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | 1429/1529 | 3.40 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 3.40 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 1251/1393 | 3.25 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 3.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.20 | 1246/1337 | 3.20 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 3.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | 1121/1331 | 3.80 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 3.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | 1210/1333 | 3.60 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 3.60 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 405 01 |
| Title: | Hist & Systems Of Psyc |
| Instructor: | Kronheim,Steven |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 6 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3.50 | 823/1014 | 3.50 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 3.50 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 406 01 |
| Title: | Adv Behavior Pathology |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Julie |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 94/1589 | 4.95 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4.79 | 253/1589 | 4.79 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.79 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 4.84 | 213/1391 | 4.84 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.84 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 4.74 | 262/1552 | 4.74 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.74 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 4.84 | 130/1495 | 4.84 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.84 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 4.53 | 381/1457 | 4.53 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.53 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 59/1572 | 4.95 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.95 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 4.42 | 1193/1589 | 4.42 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.42 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 118/1569 | 4.88 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.88 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 4.61 | 728/1530 | 4.61 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 4.83 | 248/1528 | 4.83 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 116/1529 | 4.94 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.94 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/1393 | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 88/1337 | 4.94 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.94 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 238/1331 | 4.89 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.89 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.94 | 152/1333 | 4.94 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.94 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4.88 | 90/1014 | 4.88 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 4.88 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 406 01 |
| Title: | Adv Behavior Pathology |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Julie |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.27 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.49 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.12 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 4.14 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.10 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.20 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/39 | **** | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.43 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 4.38 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.51 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/19 | **** | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.23 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 406 01 |
| Title: | Adv Behavior Pathology |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Julie |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 19 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 3.85 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 A 12 | Required for Majors | 16 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 17 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 B 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 C 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 D 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 F 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | P 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 407 01 |
| Title: | Adv Child Psychology |
| Instructor: | Goldstein,Robin |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 214/1589 | 4.85 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.85 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 569/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.54 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 517/1391 | 4.57 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 4.67 | 341/1552 | 4.67 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 135/1495 | 4.83 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.83 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 169/1457 | 4.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 267/1572 | 4.73 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.73 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 155/1569 | 4.80 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.80 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 381/1530 | 4.82 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.82 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 270/1528 | 4.82 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.82 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 194/1529 | 4.91 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.91 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1393 | 5.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 407 01 |
| Title: | Adv Child Psychology |
| Instructor: | Goldstein,Robin |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 15 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 90/1014 | 4.89 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 4.89 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 5 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 409 01 |
| Title: | Development And Educatn |
| Instructor: | Sonnenschein,Su |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 18 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 819/1589 | 4.38 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.38 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 1072/1589 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.13 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 761/1391 | 4.38 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.50 | 509/1552 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 291/1495 | 4.63 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 400/1457 | 4.50 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 986/1572 | 4.13 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 1349/1589 | 4.25 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.25 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 596/1569 | 4.33 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.33 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 887/1530 | 4.50 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 959/1533 | 4.75 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.75 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 695/1528 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 397/1529 | 4.75 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.13 | 720/1393 | 4.13 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.13 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 452/1337 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 478/1331 | 4.67 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 702/1333 | 4.50 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 409 01 |
| Title: | Development And Educatn |
| Instructor: | Sonnenschein,Su |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 18 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | 686/1014 | 3.80 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 3.80 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 437 01 |
| Title: | Making A Difference |
| Instructor: | Sto. Domingo, Ma |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 4.40 | 780/1589 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 674/1589 | 4.47 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.47 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.62 | 394/1552 | 4.62 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.62 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | 462/1495 | 4.46 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 125/1457 | 4.82 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.82 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 4.36 | 710/1572 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.36 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 4.42 | 1203/1589 | 4.42 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.42 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.31 | 634/1569 | 4.31 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4.75 | 488/1530 | 4.75 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 410/1533 | 4.94 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.60 | 570/1528 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4.60 | 615/1529 | 4.60 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.40 | 435/1393 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 146/1337 | 4.91 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.91 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 217/1331 | 4.91 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.91 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 373/1333 | 4.80 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.80 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 437 01 |
| Title: | Making A Difference |
| Instructor: | Sto. Domingo, Ma |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 24 |
| Questionnaires: | 17 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 86/1014 | 4.90 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 4.90 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 8 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 15 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 440 01 |
| Title: | Seminar In Social Psyc |
| Instructor: | Blass,Thomas |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.55 | 595/1589 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 4.55 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 555/1589 | 4.55 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 4.36 | 718/1552 | 4.36 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 143/1495 | 4.82 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.82 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 278/1457 | 4.64 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 4.27 | 815/1572 | 4.27 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.27 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 4.00 | 957/1569 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 694/1530 | 4.64 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82 | 843/1533 | 4.82 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 645/1528 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.55 | 689/1529 | 4.55 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 81/1393 | 4.91 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.91 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 510/1337 | 4.44 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.44 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 583/1331 | 4.56 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.56 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 412/1333 | 4.78 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.78 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 440 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 16 |
| Title: Seminar In Social Psyc | | Questionnaires: 11 |
| Instructor: Blass,Thomas | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 126/1014 | 4.78 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 4.78 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 442 01 |
| Title: | Seminar in I/O Psyc |
| Instructor: | Sigurdsson,Sigu |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 4 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 614/1589 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 238/1552 | 4.75 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 416/1495 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 169/1457 | 4.75 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 233/1572 | 4.75 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 183/1569 | 4.75 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 4.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 350/1528 | 4.75 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 796/1393 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 267/1337 | 4.75 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 4.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 824/1331 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 438/1333 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 4.75 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 442 01 |
| Title: | Seminar in I/O Psyc |
| Instructor: | Sigurdsson,Sigu |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 4 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 341/1014 | 4.33 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 4.33 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 455 01 |
| Title: | Schizophrenia |
| Instructor: | Schiffman,Jason |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 4.90 | 136/1589 | 4.90 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | 4.90 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82 | 242/1391 | 4.82 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.46 | 4.82 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 4.86 | 142/1552 | 4.86 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 4.86 | 126/1495 | 4.86 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.86 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 4.90 | 80/1457 | 4.90 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.90 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.80 | 176/1572 | 4.80 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 4.95 | 234/1589 | 4.95 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.95 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1569 | 5.00 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.22 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 4.89 | 241/1530 | 4.89 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.56 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.76 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 4.89 | 184/1528 | 4.89 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.41 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 4.79 | 137/1393 | 4.79 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 4.79 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.56 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 137/1014 | 4.75 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.32 | 4.75 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 455 01 |
| Title: | Schizophrenia |
| Instructor: | Schiffman,Jason |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 23 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.56 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.54 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.31 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.49 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.12 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 17 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 21 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 01 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Borrero,John C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 128/1552 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1457 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 233/1572 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1569 | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 276/1530 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.95 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 206/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.88 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 290/1393 | 4.51 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.57 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 170/1337 | 4.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 601 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 9 |
| Title: Special Topics In Psych | | Questionnaires: 8 |
| Instructor: Borrero,John C | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 196/1014 | 4.61 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.63 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 02 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Mueller,Lorin M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 14 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 607/1589 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3.85 | 1302/1589 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.85 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.38 | 693/1552 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.38 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.46 | 462/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.46 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 886/1457 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.46 | 1419/1572 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 3.46 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 806/1589 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.77 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.18 | 779/1569 | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.18 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 844/1530 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 469/1533 | 4.95 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.54 | 657/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 701/1529 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.54 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3.77 | 993/1393 | 4.51 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.77 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 452/1337 | 4.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.42 | 705/1331 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.42 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.67 | 547/1333 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 601 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 14 |
| Title: Special Topics In Psych | | Questionnaires: 14 |
| Instructor: Mueller,Lorin M | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.45 | 268/1014 | 4.61 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.45 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 4 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 9 | Required for Majors 9 | Graduate 6 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 4 | | Major 6 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 8 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 2 | D 0 | | Non-major 8 |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 9 | F 0 | Electives 3 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 1 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 03 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Milatzo,John P |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 253/1589 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1151/1589 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 600/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 668/1552 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.40 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 744/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 308/1457 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.60 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1095/1572 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 1011/1589 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.60 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 288/1569 | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 488/1530 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.95 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 281/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 266/1393 | 4.51 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 4.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 373/1333 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.80 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 03 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Milatzo,John P |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 5 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 554/1014 | 4.61 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 04 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Rosen, Theodore |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 4.64 | 463/1589 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4.43 | 734/1589 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.36 | 731/1552 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 4.64 | 273/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.64 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.43 | 487/1457 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4.50 | 495/1572 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 4.43 | 1193/1589 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.43 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.14 | 829/1569 | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.14 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.36 | 1073/1530 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4.86 | 729/1533 | 4.95 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.21 | 1026/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.21 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.14 | 1097/1529 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 102/1393 | 4.51 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.86 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.64 | 351/1337 | 4.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.64 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 4.86 | 269/1331 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 158/1014 | 4.61 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.71 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 04 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Rosen, Theodore |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 14 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 11 | Required for Majors | 5 | Graduate | 11 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 3 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 11 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 8 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 06 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Sanders,Ethan S |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 7 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 182/1589 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.86 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1552 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 416/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1457 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 137/1572 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 183/1569 | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.95 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 227/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1393 | 4.51 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 4.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 601 06 |
| Title: | Special Topics In Psych |
| Instructor: | Sanders,Ethan S |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 7 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1014 | 4.61 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 7 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 0 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 2 | Under-grad 4 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 3 | 3.50-4.00 4 | F 0 | Electives 5 | Non-major 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 601 07 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 13 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|-----------|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Special Topics In Psych | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 12 | | | | |
| Instructor: Dahlquist,Lynnd | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.17 | 1047/1589 | 4.69 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 3.58 | 1451/1589 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.58 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4.25 | 847/1552 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 3.75 | 1153/1495 | 4.43 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 498/1457 | 4.57 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.42 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2.92 | 1529/1572 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 2.92 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 754/1569 | 4.48 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.20 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 4.09 | 1284/1530 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.09 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 586/1533 | 4.95 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.91 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 756/1528 | 4.62 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 689/1529 | 4.70 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 560/1393 | 4.51 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.29 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 162/1337 | 4.82 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.89 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 277/1333 | 4.89 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.89 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 601 07 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 13 |
| Title: Special Topics In Psych | | Questionnaires: 12 |
| Instructor: Dahlquist,Lynnd | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 90/1014 | 4.61 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.89 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 602 01 |
| Title: | Bio,Cog. & Dev Bases |
| Instructor: | Katz,Jonathan L |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 3.33 | 1534/1589 | 3.33 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 3.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | 1579/1589 | 2.50 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 2.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 1298/1391 | 3.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2.45 | 1546/1552 | 2.45 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 2.45 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3.83 | 1086/1495 | 3.83 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.83 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3.27 | 1359/1457 | 3.27 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.27 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.83 | 1538/1572 | 2.83 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 2.83 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2.73 | 1544/1569 | 2.73 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 2.73 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3.75 | 1430/1530 | 3.75 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 3.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.67 | 1514/1533 | 3.67 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 3.67 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3.92 | 1246/1528 | 3.92 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 3.92 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3.08 | 1484/1529 | 3.08 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 3.08 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | 1222/1393 | 3.33 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4.10 | 774/1337 | 4.10 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.10 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3.80 | 1121/1331 | 3.80 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 3.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.60 | 1210/1333 | 3.60 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 3.60 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 602 01 |
| Title: | Bio,Cog. & Dev Bases |
| Instructor: | Katz,Jonathan L |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 8 | Required for Majors 12 | Graduate 5 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 4 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 7 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 7 | F 0 | Electives 0 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 605 01 |
| Title: | Learning And Cognition |
| Instructor: | Sigurdsson,Sigu |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 14 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.33 | 871/1589 | 4.33 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 4.42 | 749/1589 | 4.42 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.42 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 719/1391 | 4.42 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.42 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.33 | 756/1552 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 4.08 | 855/1495 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.08 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 | 886/1457 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 631/1572 | 4.42 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.42 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 4.73 | 882/1589 | 4.73 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.73 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3.71 | 1241/1569 | 3.71 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 3.71 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.50 | 887/1530 | 4.50 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 1197/1533 | 4.58 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.58 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 4.25 | 992/1528 | 4.25 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.33 | 924/1529 | 4.33 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.55 | 1120/1393 | 3.55 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.55 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 572/1337 | 4.38 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.38 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 736/1331 | 4.38 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 438/1333 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.75 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.83 | 672/1014 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 3.83 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 605 01 |
| Title: | Learning And Cognition |
| Instructor: | Sigurdsson,Sigu |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 14 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.40 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/194 | **** | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.15 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.38 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 4.75 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.17 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.25 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 2 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 10 | Non-major | 12 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 2 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 3 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 606 01 |
| Title: | Adult Psychopathology |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Christop |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 832/1589 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3.78 | 1348/1589 | 3.78 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.78 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | 826/1552 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 4.36 | 575/1495 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 363/1457 | 4.55 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.55 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.09 | 1014/1572 | 4.09 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.09 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4.00 | 957/1569 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.36 | 1061/1530 | 4.36 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.36 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.64 | 1140/1533 | 4.64 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.64 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 756/1528 | 4.45 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.45 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.36 | 893/1529 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4.00 | 796/1393 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4.18 | 716/1337 | 4.18 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.18 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3.91 | 1082/1331 | 3.91 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 3.91 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 667/1333 | 4.55 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.55 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 606 01 |
| Title: | Adult Psychopathology |
| Instructor: | Murphy,Christop |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 11 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.25 | 911/1014 | 3.25 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 3.25 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 611 01 |
| Title: | Data Analytic Proc I |
| Instructor: | Pitts,Steven C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4.80 | 228/1589 | 4.80 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 4.67 | 402/1391 | 4.67 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 135/1552 | 4.87 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.87 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4.50 | 416/1495 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 218/1457 | 4.69 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.69 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.79 | 198/1572 | 4.79 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.79 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 4.79 | 768/1589 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.79 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4.62 | 280/1569 | 4.62 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.62 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 570/1528 | 4.60 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 428/1529 | 4.73 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.73 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 435/1393 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.83 | 1292/1337 | 2.83 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 2.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2.71 | 1309/1331 | 2.71 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 2.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | 1171/1333 | 3.71 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 3.71 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1014 | **** | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | **** |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 611 01 |
| Title: | Data Analytic Proc I |
| Instructor: | Pitts,Steven C |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 16 |
| Questionnaires: | 16 |

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|---------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 4.69 | 30/180 | 4.69 | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.40 | 4.69 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 15/194 | 4.92 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 4.92 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 29/178 | 4.92 | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | 4.92 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 4.67 | 55/181 | 4.67 | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 12/165 | 4.90 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.43 | 4.90 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/22 | **** | 4.67 | 4.12 | 4.54 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/33 | **** | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.63 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 615 01 |
| Title: | Meth Appl Behav An |
| Instructor: | Kahng,Sungwoo |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.46 | 699/1589 | 4.46 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4.54 | 569/1589 | 4.54 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.54 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3.69 | 1235/1391 | 3.69 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 3.69 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 4.31 | 795/1552 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.31 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.08 | 860/1495 | 4.08 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.08 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4.08 | 841/1457 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 221/1572 | 4.77 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.77 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 806/1589 | 4.77 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.77 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 559/1569 | 4.36 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.36 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.46 | 938/1530 | 4.46 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 469/1533 | 4.92 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.92 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 657/1528 | 4.54 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.54 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4.23 | 1021/1529 | 4.23 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.23 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4.18 | 651/1393 | 4.18 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.18 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 316/1337 | 4.69 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.69 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 446/1331 | 4.69 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.69 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4.62 | 603/1333 | 4.62 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.62 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 944/1014 | 3.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 3.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 615 01 |
| Title: | Meth Appl Behav An |
| Instructor: | Kahng,Sungwoo |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 13 |
| Questionnaires: | 13 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 4.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.67 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.17 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 4 | Required for Majors | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 3 | | Graduate |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 6 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 7 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 0 |
| | | | ? 6 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 620 01 |
| Title: | Methods Of Assessment I |
| Instructor: | Schiffman,Jason |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.55 | 595/1589 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.55 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 689/1589 | 4.45 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.45 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 442/1391 | 4.64 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 299/1552 | 4.70 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.70 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 575/1495 | 4.36 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.36 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 278/1457 | 4.64 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.64 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.18 | 931/1572 | 4.18 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.18 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 113/1569 | 4.89 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.89 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 224/1530 | 4.91 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.91 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 4.55 | 645/1528 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.55 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.55 | 689/1529 | 4.55 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 266/1393 | 4.60 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.60 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 146/1337 | 4.91 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.91 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 620 01 |
| Title: | Methods Of Assessment I |
| Instructor: | Schiffman,Jason |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 11 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1014 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 623 01 |
| Title: | Clinical Interventn II |
| Instructor: | Barry,Robin A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 7 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 557/1589 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 511/1589 | 4.57 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 286/1552 | 4.71 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.71 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 211/1495 | 4.71 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 105/1457 | 4.86 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.86 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.86 | 1226/1572 | 3.86 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 3.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4.29 | 658/1569 | 4.29 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.29 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 1252/1530 | 4.14 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 607/1528 | 4.57 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.57 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 257/1529 | 4.86 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 435/1393 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.40 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 438/1333 | 4.75 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.75 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 180/1014 | 4.67 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 623 01 |
| Title: | Clinical Interventn II |
| Instructor: | Barry,Robin A |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 7 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|------------|------|---------|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 7 | Required for Majors 7 | Graduate 4 Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 0 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 0 | Under-grad 3 Non-major 7 |
| 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 responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 0 | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 636 01 |
| Title: | Primary Prevention |
| Instructor: | Maton,Kenneth |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 175/1589 | 4.89 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1552 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 169/1495 | 4.78 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.78 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 90/1457 | 4.89 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.89 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 586/1572 | 4.44 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.44 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 787/1589 | 4.78 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.78 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 171/1569 | 4.78 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.78 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 259/1530 | 4.89 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.89 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 195/1528 | 4.89 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1393 | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1337 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 554/1014 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 636 01 |
| Title: | Primary Prevention |
| Instructor: | Maton,Kenneth |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 9 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/62 | 5.00 | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/65 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.61 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/63 | 5.00 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/61 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 9/61 | 4.88 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.88 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 650 01 |
| Title: | Child Clinical Psychology |
| Instructor: | Dahlquist,Lynnd |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 185/1589 | 4.88 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.38 | 802/1589 | 4.38 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 1268/1552 | 3.80 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 3.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 416/1495 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 545/1457 | 4.38 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.38 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.75 | 1287/1572 | 3.75 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 3.75 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 901/1589 | 4.71 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.71 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 509/1569 | 4.40 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.40 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.50 | 887/1530 | 4.50 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 671/1533 | 4.88 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 539/1528 | 4.63 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 232/1529 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 629/1393 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.20 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 170/1337 | 4.88 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 248/1331 | 4.88 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.88 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 592/1333 | 4.63 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.63 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 650 01 |
| Title: | Child Clinical Psychology |
| Instructor: | Dahlquist,Lynnd |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 205/1014 | 4.60 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.60 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 651 01 |
| Title: | Cognitive Development |
| Instructor: | Sonnenschein,Su |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 6 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 1047/1589 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.83 | 1308/1589 | 3.83 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.83 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 301/1391 | 4.75 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 943/1552 | 4.17 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.17 | 784/1495 | 4.17 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.17 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | 1340/1457 | 3.33 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1366/1572 | 3.60 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 3.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 956/1589 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3.60 | 1319/1569 | 3.60 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 3.60 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 644/1530 | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 1065/1528 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 1050/1529 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | 1057/1393 | 3.67 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 452/1337 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 623/1331 | 4.50 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 832/1333 | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.33 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1014 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 651 01 |
| Title: | Cognitive Development |
| Instructor: | Sonnenschein,Su |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 6 |
| Questionnaires: | 6 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 655 01 |
| Title: | Adv Top A Behav An |
| Instructor: | Donaldson,Jeann |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3.80 | 1358/1589 | 3.80 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 3.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 996/1589 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 1268/1552 | 3.80 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 3.80 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 309/1495 | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 732/1457 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.20 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 913/1572 | 4.20 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.20 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 730/1589 | 4.80 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.80 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 369/1569 | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1319/1530 | 4.00 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1171/1528 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1174/1529 | 4.00 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1393 | **** | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 550/1337 | 4.40 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 180/1014 | 4.67 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 655 01 |
| Title: | Adv Top A Behav An |
| Instructor: | Donaldson,Jeann |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/62 | 5.00 | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/61 | 5.00 | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/61 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 656 01 |
| Title: | Applied Social Psyc |
| Instructor: | Bediako,Shawn M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1587/1589 | 2.00 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 2.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1587/1589 | 2.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 2.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | 1391/1391 | 1.67 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 1.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.40 | 1548/1552 | 2.40 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 2.40 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 1307/1495 | 3.50 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 1364/1457 | 3.25 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.25 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.60 | 1571/1572 | 1.60 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 1.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 1213/1589 | 4.40 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.40 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1564/1569 | 2.00 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 2.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1528/1530 | 2.00 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 2.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3.50 | 1520/1533 | 3.50 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 3.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.75 | 1527/1528 | 1.75 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 1.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.25 | 1529/1529 | 1.25 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 1.25 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3.60 | 1090/1337 | 3.60 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 3.60 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 861/1331 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1259/1333 | 3.40 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 3.40 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 656 01 |
| Title: | Applied Social Psyc |
| Instructor: | Bediako,Shawn M |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 9 |
| Questionnaires: | 5 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | 997/1014 | 2.50 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 2.50 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 21 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 4.25 | 957/1589 | 4.25 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 3.70 | 1401/1589 | 3.70 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4.15 | 963/1391 | 4.15 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.15 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 3.70 | 1334/1552 | 3.70 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 3.70 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 4.55 | 362/1495 | 4.55 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.55 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3.53 | 1260/1457 | 3.53 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.53 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 3.65 | 1339/1572 | 3.65 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 3.65 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 4.60 | 1011/1589 | 4.60 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.60 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3.71 | 1249/1569 | 3.71 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 3.71 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 3.90 | 1385/1530 | 3.90 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 3.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 293/1533 | 4.95 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 3.80 | 1311/1528 | 3.80 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 3.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3.45 | 1417/1529 | 3.45 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 3.45 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3.45 | 1168/1393 | 3.45 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.45 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 4.05 | 798/1337 | 4.05 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.05 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 4.85 | 269/1331 | 4.85 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.85 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4.70 | 503/1333 | 4.70 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.70 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 21 |
| Questionnaires: | 20 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|----|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 4.10 | 507/1014 | 4.10 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 4.10 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 8 | 0.00-0.99 | 4 | A | 17 | Required for Majors | 19 | Graduate | 12 | Major | 20 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 8 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 12 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 671 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: | 21 |
| Title: | Seminar in Social Psycho | | Questionnaires: | 21 |
| Instructor: | Lasson, Elliot D | | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3.61 | 1460/1589 | 3.61 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 3.61 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.11 | 1082/1589 | 4.11 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.11 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.33 | 799/1391 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 4.00 | 1081/1552 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4.00 | 899/1495 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 4.28 | 659/1457 | 4.28 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.28 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.50 | 495/1572 | 4.50 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3.85 | 1134/1569 | 3.85 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 3.85 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 4.28 | 1153/1530 | 4.28 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.28 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4.50 | 1261/1533 | 4.50 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4.17 | 1065/1528 | 4.17 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4.00 | 1174/1529 | 4.00 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2.82 | 1345/1393 | 2.82 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 2.82 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 4.27 | 655/1337 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.27 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 401/1331 | 4.73 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.73 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.60 | 615/1333 | 4.60 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.60 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3.11 | 938/1014 | 3.11 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 3.11 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 671 01 |
| Title: | Seminar in Social Psycho |
| Instructor: | Lasson, Elliot D |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 21 |
| Questionnaires: | 21 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 6 | 0.00-0.99 3 | A 13 | Required for Majors 14 | Graduate 5 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 3 | | Major 13 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General 1 | Under-grad 16 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | | Non-major 8 |
| Grad. | 5 | 3.50-4.00 6 | F 0 | Electives 1 | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 5 | | |

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 672 01 |
| Title: | Intro to Dat Anlytc Proc |
| Instructor: | Griffith,James |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 435/1589 | 4.61 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4.50 | 614/1589 | 4.42 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 402/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 425/1552 | 4.56 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4.67 | 255/1495 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 125/1457 | 4.55 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.82 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 358/1572 | 4.37 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.64 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4.50 | 1116/1589 | 4.58 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 694/1569 | 4.28 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4.17 | 1237/1530 | 4.25 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.17 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 4.94 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4.17 | 1065/1528 | 4.25 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.17 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4.58 | 639/1529 | 4.51 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.58 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.89 | 922/1393 | 4.15 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.89 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 422/1337 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.55 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.09 | 961/1331 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.09 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.55 | 667/1333 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.55 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | 823/1014 | 3.65 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 3.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 672 01 |
| Title: | Intro to Dat Anlytc Proc |
| Instructor: | Griffith,James |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/180 | **** | 4.16 | 4.20 | 4.40 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | 189/194 | 2.67 | 4.00 | 4.17 | 4.15 | 2.67 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/178 | **** | 4.32 | 4.47 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/181 | **** | 4.14 | 4.40 | 4.38 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/165 | **** | 3.96 | 4.12 | 4.43 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/62 | **** | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/65 | **** | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/63 | **** | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.42 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 42/61 | 4.33 | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/61 | **** | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.85 | 4.75 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/40 | **** | **** | 3.89 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/32 | **** | **** | 4.30 | 4.67 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/29 | **** | **** | 4.15 | 4.17 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/21 | **** | **** | 4.32 | 4.00 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 18/39 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 8/22 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.12 | 4.54 | 4.67 |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 17/33 | 4.67 | 4.67 | 4.42 | 4.63 | 4.67 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 672 01 |
| Title: | Intro to Dat Anlytc Proc |
| Instructor: | Griffith,James |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 12 |
| Questionnaires: | 12 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 14/19 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.44 | 4.06 | 4.00 |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/16 | **** | **** | 4.25 | 4.25 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|---|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 8 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 6 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 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. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 672 02 |
| Title: | Intro to Dat Anlytc Proc |
| Instructor: | Sady,Kayo G |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Enrollment: | 18 |
| Questionnaires: | 18 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|----|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 4.56 | 582/1589 | 4.61 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 4.33 | 853/1589 | 4.42 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 4.33 | 799/1391 | 4.50 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.53 | 488/1552 | 4.56 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.53 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 3.61 | 1245/1495 | 4.14 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 3.61 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4.29 | 649/1457 | 4.55 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 4.29 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 4.11 | 995/1572 | 4.37 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.11 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4.67 | 956/1589 | 4.58 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.31 | 621/1569 | 4.28 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.31 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.33 | 1095/1530 | 4.25 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 4.89 | 643/1533 | 4.94 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 4.33 | 909/1528 | 4.25 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 4.44 | 806/1529 | 4.51 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.41 | 426/1393 | 4.15 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.41 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.46 | 491/1337 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.46 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.31 | 788/1331 | 4.20 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.31 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.15 | 946/1333 | 4.35 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.15 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 672 02 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 18 |
| Title: Intro to Dat Anlytc Proc | | Questionnaires: 18 |
| Instructor: Sady,Kayo G | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | 686/1014 | 3.65 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 3.80 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 3 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 16 | Major | 16 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 2 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 16 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 0 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 695 01 |
| Title: | Sem In Human Serv Psyc |
| Instructor: | Diclemente,Carl |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 646/1589 | 4.50 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.33 | 853/1589 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 847/1552 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 309/1495 | 4.60 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3.80 | 1087/1457 | 3.80 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4.00 | 1095/1572 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 241/1569 | 4.67 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 4.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 644/1530 | 4.67 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 479/1528 | 4.67 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 530/1529 | 4.67 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4.17 | 674/1393 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.17 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 663/1337 | 4.25 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 623/1331 | 4.50 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 884/1333 | 4.25 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.25 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 37/62 | 4.50 | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.50 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 35/65 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.61 | 4.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 695 01 |
| Title: | Sem In Human Serv Psyc |
| Instructor: | Diclemente,Carl |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 7 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 27/63 | 4.50 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 34/61 | 4.50 | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 42/61 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| Course-Section: PSYC 720 01 | | Term - Fall 2012 | | | | | | | | Enrollment: 3 | | | | |
|---|----|------------------|---|---|---|---|------------|------|----------|-------------------|------|-------|------|------|
| Title: Infant Assessment | | | | | | | | | | Questionnaires: 3 | | | | |
| Instructor: Hussey-Gardner, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect | |
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1552 | 5.00 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 609/1495 | 4.33 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1457 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1572 | 5.00 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1569 | 5.00 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 5.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1530 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1529 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 221/1393 | 4.67 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 4.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 337/1337 | 4.67 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1331 | 5.00 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1333 | 5.00 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 5.00 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Course-Section: PSYC 720 01 | Term - Fall 2012 | Enrollment: 3 |
| Title: Infant Assessment | | Questionnaires: 3 |
| Instructor: Hussey-Gardner, | | |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|--------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1014 | 5.00 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 5.00 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 738 01 |
| Title: | Qualitative Methods |
| Instructor: | Segal,Eden |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 1089/1589 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3.43 | 1491/1589 | 3.43 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.33 | 3.43 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 1061/1391 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.63 | 1371/1552 | 3.63 | 4.22 | 4.25 | 4.30 | 3.63 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 564/1495 | 4.38 | 4.25 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.38 | 1324/1457 | 3.38 | 4.12 | 4.15 | 4.30 | 3.38 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2.86 | 1536/1572 | 2.86 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 2.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1589 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.66 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3.50 | 1367/1569 | 3.50 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.18 | 3.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.88 | 1395/1530 | 3.88 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.55 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1533 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.75 | 4.82 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.88 | 1271/1528 | 3.88 | 4.35 | 4.35 | 4.38 | 3.88 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.88 | 1269/1529 | 3.88 | 4.36 | 4.36 | 4.38 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1311/1393 | 3.00 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.91 | 3.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4.25 | 663/1337 | 4.25 | 4.19 | 4.17 | 4.29 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4.75 | 379/1331 | 4.75 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.51 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 802/1333 | 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.38 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3.50 | 823/1014 | 3.50 | 4.03 | 4.05 | 4.13 | 3.50 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Course-Section: | PSYC 738 01 |
| Title: | Qualitative Methods |
| Instructor: | Segal,Eden |

Term - Fall 2012

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Enrollment: | 8 |
| Questionnaires: | 8 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 35/62 | 4.63 | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.44 | 4.63 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4.38 | 40/65 | 4.38 | 4.34 | 4.43 | 4.61 | 4.38 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.29 | 40/63 | 4.29 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4.00 | 49/61 | 4.00 | 4.57 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.13 | 41/61 | 4.13 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.22 | 4.13 |

Frequency Distribution

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