

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 75  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1360  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	6	13	4.26	985/1670	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.23	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	0	4	7	9	3.83	1370/1666	3.98	4.16	4.27	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	8	8	3.87	1153/1406	3.94	4.33	4.32	4.31	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	953/1615	4.12	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	14	4.30	589/1566	4.25	4.03	4.07	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1429/1528	3.40	4.09	4.12	4.00	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	5	11	4.08	1090/1650	4.13	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	5	18	4.63	1062/1667	4.76	4.68	4.67	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	1	6	6	2	3.44	1421/1626	3.61	4.00	4.11	4.07	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	6	2	12	3.92	1344/1559	4.19	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	985/1560	4.62	4.65	4.72	4.68	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	4	7	7	3.77	1299/1549	4.00	4.25	4.31	4.32	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	3	10	3.70	1317/1546	4.02	4.23	4.32	4.32	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	7	11	4.23	567/1323	4.31	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	2	4	6	3.56	1075/1384	3.52	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1074/1378	3.71	4.29	4.29	4.09	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	4	2	3	6	3.56	1174/1378	3.60	4.32	4.31	4.08	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	779/ 904	3.49	3.80	4.03	3.94	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 75  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1360  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1361  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	20	0	2	1	6	18	31	4.29	953/1670	4.28	4.19	4.31	4.23	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	2	1	10	19	26	4.14	1103/1666	3.98	4.16	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	0	3	2	10	19	24	4.02	1051/1406	3.94	4.33	4.32	4.31	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	21	18	2	1	7	12	17	4.05	1055/1615	4.12	4.16	4.24	4.17	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	2	2	1	9	16	28	4.20	706/1566	4.25	4.03	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	28	3	2	8	6	11	3.67	1202/1528	3.40	4.09	4.12	4.00	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	20	1	2	2	10	13	30	4.18	997/1650	4.13	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	21	0	0	1	1	1	54	4.89	693/1667	4.76	4.68	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	2	4	11	23	13	3.77	1240/1626	3.61	4.00	4.11	4.07	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	2	1	2	15	35	4.45	959/1559	4.19	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	2	0	3	15	37	4.49	1255/1560	4.62	4.65	4.72	4.68	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	0	8	19	27	4.23	994/1549	4.00	4.25	4.31	4.32	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	2	2	2	19	31	4.34	919/1546	4.02	4.23	4.32	4.32	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	0	2	2	5	11	37	4.39	439/1323	4.31	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	4	2	6	4	9	3.48	1110/1384	3.52	4.01	4.10	3.92	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	4	4	3	2	12	3.56	1170/1378	3.71	4.29	4.29	4.09	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	53	0	3	2	7	2	11	3.64	1153/1378	3.60	4.32	4.31	4.08	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	54	1	4	1	4	4	10	3.65	675/ 904	3.49	3.80	4.03	3.94	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	69	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	3	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	74	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	74	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	74	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	74	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	75	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	75	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	75	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	75	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	75	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201  
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1361  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	78	Non-major	77
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0101  
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS  
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1362  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	28	4.71	427/1670	4.57	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	216/1666	4.57	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	191/1406	4.63	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	254/1615	4.39	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	4	7	16	4.21	697/1566	4.36	4.03	4.07	4.00	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	21	4.52	413/1528	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	180/1650	4.63	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	472/1667	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	0	6	18	4.60	324/1626	4.30	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	111/1559	4.87	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	239/1560	4.88	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	202/1549	4.75	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	231/1546	4.73	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	27	4.75	183/1323	4.59	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	210/1384	4.41	4.01	4.10	4.07	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	285/1378	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	141/1378	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.26	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	56/ 904	4.96	3.80	4.03	4.01	4.96
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0101  
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS  
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1362  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	34	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201  
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS  
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 91  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1363  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	654/1670	4.57	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	719/1666	4.57	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	620/1406	4.63	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	990/1615	4.39	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	344/1566	4.36	4.03	4.07	4.00	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	17	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	842/1528	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	499/1650	4.63	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	270/1667	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	605/1626	4.30	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	469/1559	4.87	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	725/1560	4.88	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	562/1549	4.75	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	2	22	4.61	595/1546	4.73	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	299/1323	4.59	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	608/1384	4.41	4.01	4.10	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	970/1378	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.26	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	****/ 904	4.96	3.80	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12	General 6	Under-grad 31 Non-major 17
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0301  
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS  
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1364  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	665/1670	4.57	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	784/1666	4.57	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	597/1406	4.63	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	910/1615	4.39	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	621/1566	4.36	4.03	4.07	4.00	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	899/1528	4.21	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	645/1650	4.63	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1667	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	15	1	3.94	1055/1626	4.30	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	339/1559	4.87	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	829/1560	4.88	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	410/1549	4.75	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	495/1546	4.73	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	374/1323	4.59	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	803/1384	4.41	4.01	4.10	4.07	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	0	8	4.33	797/1378	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	580/1378	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.26	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 904	4.96	3.80	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING  
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 103  
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1365  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	66	4.83	271/1670	4.64	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	68	4.87	198/1666	4.75	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	67	4.83	240/1406	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	32	0	1	2	7	35	4.69	357/1615	4.50	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	9	15	11	34	3.77	1129/1566	3.91	4.03	4.07	4.00	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	53	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	285/1528	4.68	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	71	4.91	159/1650	4.85	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	74	4.97	203/1667	4.99	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	1	0	1	11	50	4.73	223/1626	4.51	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	74	4.97	83/1559	4.94	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	75	4.99	120/1560	4.95	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	70	4.91	202/1549	4.78	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	71	4.93	162/1546	4.81	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	4	67	4.84	144/1323	4.70	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	3	8	25	4.45	498/1384	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.07	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	1	1	2	4	30	4.61	525/1378	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	0	1	3	4	30	4.66	541/1378	4.63	4.32	4.31	4.26	4.66
4. Were special techniques successful	39	17	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	198/ 904	4.62	3.80	4.03	4.01	4.62
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.33	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	44	Required for Majors		11	Graduate	2	Major	38
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	23							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	12	C	5	General		3	Under-grad	75	Non-major	39
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0							
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		56				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING  
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S  
 Enrollment: 100  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1366  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	5	20	30	4.45	737/1670	4.64	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	18	36	4.64	452/1666	4.75	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	13	38	4.62	483/1406	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	26	1	0	3	10	15	4.31	800/1615	4.50	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	5	9	11	27	4.04	832/1566	3.91	4.03	4.07	4.00	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	41	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	****/1528	4.68	4.09	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	246/1650	4.85	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	55	5.00	1/1667	4.99	4.68	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	5	24	19	4.29	681/1626	4.51	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	50	4.91	276/1559	4.94	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	49	4.91	596/1560	4.95	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	15	37	4.65	512/1549	4.78	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	11	41	4.69	495/1546	4.81	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	0	4	10	36	4.57	294/1323	4.70	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	638/1384	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.07	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	459/1378	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	590/1378	4.63	4.32	4.31	4.26	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	39	15	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 904	4.62	3.80	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 32	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 24
28-55	14	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 6	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 59 Non-major 35
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 42	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 230 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE  
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1367  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	5	4	16	11	3.84	1393/1670	3.84	4.19	4.31	4.32	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	4	5	12	16	4.08	1148/1666	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	5	10	21	4.38	751/1406	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	2	7	7	17	4.18	953/1615	4.18	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	7	11	15	3.92	994/1566	3.92	4.03	4.07	4.00	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	10	12	12	3.84	1097/1528	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.11	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	4	12	20	4.38	757/1650	4.38	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	22	11	3	3.43	1653/1667	3.43	4.68	4.67	4.64	3.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	7	11	8	3.96	1021/1626	3.96	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	13	21	4.53	871/1559	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	911/1560	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	8	7	18	4.14	1070/1549	4.14	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	2	2	12	18	4.35	899/1546	4.35	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	2	10	22	4.49	345/1323	4.49	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	730/1384	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.07	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	637/1378	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	428/1378	4.76	4.32	4.31	4.26	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	24	3	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	587/ 904	3.86	3.80	4.03	4.01	3.86
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 230 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE  
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1367  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	41	Non-major	31
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R  
 Enrollment: 63  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1368  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	8	26	4.59	567/1670	4.26	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	22	4.49	654/1666	4.20	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	25	4.51	586/1406	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	7	8	20	4.31	813/1615	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	0	4	9	17	4.12	771/1566	4.06	4.03	4.07	4.00	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	15	14	4.08	853/1528	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	2	30	4.68	349/1650	4.23	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	21	15	4.38	1279/1667	4.58	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	6	14	6	4.00	953/1626	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	387/1559	4.42	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	35	4.92	536/1560	4.68	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	29	4.73	410/1549	4.40	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	31	4.73	445/1546	4.36	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	1	6	26	4.50	326/1323	4.35	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	820/1384	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	2	3	6	9	3.95	1013/1378	3.51	4.29	4.29	4.25	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	608/1378	3.89	4.32	4.31	4.26	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	18	10	2	2	0	3	3	3.30	787/ 904	3.30	3.80	4.03	4.01	3.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 38 Non-major 30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: ARNHEIM, DANIEL  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1369  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	5	9	19	10	3.79	1419/1670	4.26	4.19	4.31	4.32	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	3	17	7	12	3.47	1522/1666	4.20	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	8	12	15	3.74	1210/1406	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.39	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	1	4	11	8	10	3.65	1393/1615	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.29	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	9	12	16	3.95	930/1566	4.06	4.03	4.07	4.00	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	4	4	9	7	10	3.44	1306/1528	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.11	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	8	9	14	9	3.42	1498/1650	4.23	4.10	4.22	4.20	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	26	17	4.40	1263/1667	4.58	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	4	0	12	17	2	3.37	1448/1626	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	4	5	19	12	3.83	1382/1559	4.42	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	8	12	21	4.19	1431/1560	4.68	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	13	12	13	3.76	1303/1549	4.40	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	11	13	13	3.67	1325/1546	4.36	4.23	4.32	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	2	5	12	19	3.95	756/1323	4.35	4.13	4.00	4.08	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	1212/1384	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.07	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	3	3	1	4	3	3.07	1294/1378	3.51	4.29	4.29	4.25	3.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	4	2	5	2	3.21	1284/1378	3.89	4.32	4.31	4.26	3.21
4. Were special techniques successful	30	11	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	3.30	3.80	4.03	4.01	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	8
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 1	B 20		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	23

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

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1370  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	0	3	12	21	4.41	809/1670	4.26	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	8	26	4.64	452/1666	4.20	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	6	29	4.73	352/1406	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	0	0	5	8	20	4.45	619/1615	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	2	2	5	5	19	4.12	771/1566	4.06	4.03	4.07	4.00	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	2	5	11	15	4.00	899/1528	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	1	9	25	4.58	457/1650	4.23	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	36	4.97	203/1667	4.58	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	4	5	18	4.39	573/1626	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	7	26	4.59	784/1559	4.42	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	358/1560	4.68	4.65	4.72	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	439/1549	4.40	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	5	28	4.67	520/1546	4.36	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	4	4	27	4.58	283/1323	4.35	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	****/1384	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	****/1378	3.51	4.29	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	****/1378	3.89	4.32	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	32	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	3.30	3.80	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301  
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1370  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	23	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	40	Non-major	33
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PSYC 305 0101  
 Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 131  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1371  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	3	4	7	13	23	3.98	1241/1670	3.98	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.98
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	5	13	15	15	3.72	1424/1666	3.72	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	3	11	15	19	4.04	1033/1406	4.04	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	28	2	3	7	4	6	3.41	1496/1615	3.41	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	6	8	13	20	3.88	1039/1566	3.88	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	36	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1212/1528	3.64	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	4	2	15	28	4.37	769/1650	4.37	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	1	19	28	4.51	1149/1667	4.51	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	3	12	20	6	3.58	1354/1626	3.58	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	3	11	30	4.43	996/1559	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	8	39	4.77	911/1560	4.77	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	4	7	15	20	3.98	1173/1549	3.98	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	6	15	22	4.08	1110/1546	4.08	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	2	3	3	16	21	4.13	634/1323	4.13	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	5	2	2	4	8	3.38	1149/1384	3.38	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	4	1	5	2	9	3.52	1185/1378	3.52	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	3	2	2	3	11	3.81	1086/1378	3.81	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	34	13	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 305 0101  
 Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 131  
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1371  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	13	C	8	General	15	Under-grad	55	Non-major	33
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	7	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	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 306 0101  
 Title LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVELOP  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 123  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1372  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	8	30	19	4.05	1194/1670	4.05	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	8	26	22	4.03	1180/1666	4.03	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	16	19	23	4.02	1051/1406	4.02	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	15	21	20	4.02	1077/1615	4.02	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.02
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	19	33	4.37	530/1566	4.37	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	6	11	19	20	3.80	1128/1528	3.80	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	9	12	33	4.11	1067/1650	4.11	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	59	4.98	135/1667	4.98	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	12	24	10	3.89	1133/1626	3.89	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	1	15	39	4.60	784/1559	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	9	45	4.74	985/1560	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	5	21	30	4.40	816/1549	4.40	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	8	18	27	4.21	1017/1546	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	6	12	34	4.49	335/1323	4.49	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	7	7	10	4.04	810/1384	4.04	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	587/1378	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	225/1378	4.92	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	36	4	1	1	4	5	10	4.05	453/ 904	4.05	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.05

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 22		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 6	C 4	General 9	Under-grad 61 Non-major 53
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 33	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 307 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING  
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN  
 Enrollment: 109  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1373  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	7	13	22	4.18	1082/1670	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	8	12	20	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	15	22	4.27	868/1406	4.27	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	1	1	1	6	13	4.32	800/1615	4.32	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	6	9	26	4.35	549/1566	4.35	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	3	1	2	3	8	3.71	1182/1528	3.71	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	5	6	31	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	25	18	4.36	1287/1667	4.36	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	2	3	15	12	4.16	843/1626	4.16	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	10	31	4.58	809/1559	4.58	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	38	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	16	23	4.41	816/1549	4.41	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	11	28	4.40	849/1546	4.40	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	7	5	27	4.37	456/1323	4.37	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	2	2	6	12	3.88	940/1384	3.88	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	0	4	17	4.24	872/1378	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	1	0	1	22	4.54	634/1378	4.54	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	21	16	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1 Major 21
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 25		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General 12	Under-grad 45 Non-major 25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101  
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1374  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	25	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1139/1670	4.13	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	25	0	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1470/1666	3.63	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	26	0	0	2	5	1	7	3.87	1153/1406	3.87	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	25	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1188/1615	3.94	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	460/1566	4.44	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	25	1	2	1	6	2	4	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	25	0	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	25	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	1	1	8	6	0	3.19	1513/1626	3.19	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	1150/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1163/1560	4.60	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1256/1549	3.87	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	979/1546	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	634/1323	4.13	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	****/1384	****	4.01	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	****/1378	****	4.29	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	****/1378	****	4.32	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	6	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 41 Non-major 36
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0		
				I 0	Other 9	
				? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME  
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1375  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	7	10	10	5	3.41	1566/1670	3.41	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	6	10	5	5	2.91	1625/1666	2.91	4.16	4.27	4.18	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	7	10	9	3.63	1245/1406	3.63	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	9	4	9	5	3.29	1524/1615	3.29	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	9	6	7	3.23	1419/1566	3.23	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	6	8	8	6	3.41	1322/1528	3.41	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	13	7	6	2	1	2.00	1637/1650	2.00	4.10	4.22	4.12	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	19	11	4.32	1318/1667	4.32	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	5	10	8	2	2.97	1544/1626	2.97	4.00	4.11	4.06	2.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	7	9	7	6	3.19	1507/1559	3.19	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	12	17	4.44	1302/1560	4.44	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	6	9	8	3	2.88	1509/1549	2.88	4.25	4.31	4.25	2.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	10	7	6	6	3.13	1465/1546	3.13	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	4	0	4	2	4	3.14	1161/1323	3.14	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	4	6	7	3	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	954/1378	4.05	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	931/1378	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	3	4	3	9	3.95	526/ 904	3.95	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 25
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 33	Non-major 8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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 20		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 324 0101  
 Title INTRO INTERVIEW TECHN  
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1376  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	12	12	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	14	7	3.83	1363/1666	3.83	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	1015/1406	4.08	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	10	13	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	7	9	8	3.71	1173/1566	3.71	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	10	14	4.23	724/1528	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	4	1	5	11	4	3.40	1503/1650	3.40	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	270/1667	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	8	10	9	3.90	1133/1626	3.90	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	6	10	12	4.07	1265/1559	4.07	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	803/1560	4.83	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	10	14	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	13	11	4.13	1079/1546	4.13	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	4	7	3	7	3.39	1084/1323	3.39	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	476/1384	4.47	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	128/ 904	4.80	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 22	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 30	Non-major 4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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 17		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 330 8620  
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1377  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	1	0	1	8	18	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	1	1	6	19	4.46	686/1666	4.46	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	16	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	1	0	4	5	17	4.37	724/1615	4.37	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	7	1	2	1	4	13	4.24	664/1566	4.24	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	7	18	4.46	476/1528	4.46	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	0	2	5	20	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	270/1667	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	371/1626	4.55	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	1	1	7	17	4.41	1022/1559	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	0	0	25	4.88	647/1560	4.88	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	2	22	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	423/1323	4.41	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	22	4.57	390/1384	4.57	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	0	7	16	4.54	226/ 904	4.54	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.54
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****



Course-Section: PSYC 330 8620  
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR  
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1377  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	35	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: BEALL, LISA C  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1378  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	8	11	15	4.00	1216/1670	3.50	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	6	11	14	3.86	1344/1666	3.63	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	13	13	3.89	1136/1406	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	5	12	14	4.00	1083/1615	3.71	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	4	7	11	12	3.75	1144/1566	4.02	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	4	13	12	4.13	823/1528	3.43	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	6	9	15	3.89	1288/1650	3.26	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	805/1667	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	3	7	19	1	3.60	1347/1626	3.46	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	15	14	4.14	1237/1559	3.84	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	5	12	18	4.31	1398/1560	4.16	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	5	2	12	15	3.92	1227/1549	3.56	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	9	19	4.19	1032/1546	3.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	3	8	6	10	3.66	965/1323	3.30	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	749/1384	3.22	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1013/1378	3.13	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	867/1378	3.35	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	693/ 904	2.87	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.62
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	184/ 232	3.88	3.75	4.19	4.04	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	191/ 239	3.75	4.02	4.21	3.99	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	3	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	3	2	1	2	4	3.17	221/ 231	3.33	3.88	4.31	4.11	3.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	4	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 87	2.00	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	1.00	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	1.00	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: BEALL, LISA C  
 Enrollment: 76  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1378  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	38	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1379  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	835/1670	3.50	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1439/1666	3.63	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	1057/1406	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1246/1615	3.71	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	510/1566	4.02	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1063/1528	3.43	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	1	4	3.46	1477/1650	3.26	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1354/1626	3.46	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	1171/1559	3.84	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	1340/1560	4.16	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1443/1549	3.56	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1317/1546	3.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	864/1323	3.30	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1137/1384	3.22	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1163/1378	3.13	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1110/1378	3.35	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	2.87	3.80	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	147/ 232	3.88	3.75	4.19	4.04	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	191/ 239	3.75	4.02	4.21	3.99	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	204/ 231	3.33	3.88	4.31	4.11	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	2.00	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1380  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	518/1670	3.50	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	104/1666	3.63	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1406	4.30	4.33	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	106/1615	3.71	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	962/1566	4.02	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	240/1528	3.43	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	327/1650	3.26	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1667	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	278/1626	3.46	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1559	3.84	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	358/1560	4.16	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1549	3.56	4.25	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1546	3.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	223/1323	3.30	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	638/1384	3.22	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	970/1378	3.13	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	751/1378	3.35	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	461/ 904	2.87	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	3.88	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 239	3.75	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	3.33	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	16	
			? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0302  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I  
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1381  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1670/1670	3.50	4.19	4.31	4.24	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1661/1666	3.63	4.16	4.27	4.18	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1613/1615	3.71	4.16	4.24	4.18	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1527/1528	3.43	4.09	4.12	4.07	1.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1648/1650	3.26	4.10	4.22	4.12	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1612/1626	3.46	4.00	4.11	4.06	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1549/1559	3.84	4.38	4.46	4.40	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1546/1560	4.16	4.65	4.72	4.67	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1534/1549	3.56	4.25	4.31	4.25	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1545/1546	3.47	4.23	4.32	4.24	1.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1318/1323	3.30	4.13	4.00	3.99	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1382/1384	3.22	4.01	4.10	4.12	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1373/1378	3.13	4.29	4.29	4.30	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1376/1378	3.35	4.32	4.31	4.33	1.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	899/ 904	2.87	3.80	4.03	4.03	1.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	87/ 87	2.00	3.87	4.65	4.30	2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	79/ 79	1.00	3.49	4.45	3.68	1.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	80/ 80	1.00	2.69	3.97	3.76	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1382  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	3	3.81	1407/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1585/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	5	2	3.25	1325/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1325/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1329/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	9	4	3.81	1113/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	1	6	3.25	1541/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1583/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	2	7	1	3.31	1473/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	1265/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	1248/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	1374/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	5	6	3.69	1321/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	3	1	1	4	3.18	1149/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	3	1	3.14	1239/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	1	5	4	3.50	1193/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1070/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	752/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	3	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1383  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	3	3.81	1407/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1585/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	5	2	3.25	1325/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1325/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1329/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	9	4	3.81	1113/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	1	6	3.25	1541/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1583/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1220/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1280/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1496/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1270/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1329/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	3	1	3.14	1239/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	1	5	4	3.50	1193/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1070/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	752/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	14	
			? 0			



Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1384  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	3	3.81	1407/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1585/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	5	2	3.25	1325/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1325/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1329/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	9	4	3.81	1113/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	1	6	3.25	1541/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1583/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1602/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	2	4	0	0	2.67	1535/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1555/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	2	3	0	0	2.33	1530/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1542/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	3	1	3.14	1239/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	1	5	4	3.50	1193/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1070/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	752/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	14	
			? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1385  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	9	3	3.81	1407/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1585/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	5	2	3.25	1325/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1325/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1329/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	9	4	3.81	1113/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	1	6	3.25	1541/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	1583/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1427/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1418/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1467/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1358/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1379/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	8	3	1	3.14	1239/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	1	5	4	3.50	1193/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1070/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	752/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 8			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	14	
			? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0102  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1386  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1139/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	622/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	330/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1368/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	953/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	739/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	789/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0102  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1387  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1139/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	622/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	330/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1368/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	953/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1092/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1411/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0102  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1388  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1139/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	622/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	330/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1368/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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 7		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1389  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1071/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1142/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1003/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	440/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	600/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1079/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1127/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1491/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1143/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	1126/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1365/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	2	6	3.82	1268/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	834/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	820/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	878/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	711/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	605/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1389  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1390  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1071/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1142/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1003/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	440/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	600/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1079/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1127/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1496/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1354/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	820/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	878/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	711/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	605/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****



Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1390  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1391  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1071/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1142/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1003/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	440/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	600/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1079/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1127/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1312/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1431/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1467/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1285/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1354/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	820/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	878/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	711/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	605/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1391  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1392  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1071/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1142/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1003/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1083/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	440/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	600/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1079/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1127/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	347/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1022/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1398/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	919/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	590/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	820/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	878/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	711/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	605/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0103  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1392  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: FINGER, MARIA Y (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1393  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	794/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	440/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	375/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	335/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	6	0	2	6	3.12	1456/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	546/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	615/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	909/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	483/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	403/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	647/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	439/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	14	4.59	619/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	326/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1141/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	831/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	751/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	214/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		13				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: FINGER, MARIA Y (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1394  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	794/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	440/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	375/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	335/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	6	0	2	6	3.12	1456/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	546/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	615/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	909/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1218/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1090/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1141/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	831/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	751/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	214/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1395  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	794/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	440/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	375/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	335/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	6	0	2	6	3.12	1456/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	546/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	615/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	909/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1199/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1027/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1032/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1141/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	831/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	751/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	214/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		13				
				?	0							



Course-Section: PSYC 332 0202  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: FINGER, MARIA Y (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1396  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	996/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	948/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	509/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	0	3.08	1463/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1097/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1008/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	805/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	670/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	673/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	1248/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	586/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	835/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	692/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	670/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	603/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1189/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0202  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1397  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	996/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	948/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	509/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	0	3.08	1463/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1097/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1008/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	805/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1408/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1467/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1345/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	919/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	670/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	603/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1189/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0202  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1398  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	996/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	948/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	509/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	0	3.08	1463/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1097/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1008/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	805/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	570/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	481/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	670/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	603/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1189/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0203  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: FINGER, MARIA Y (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1399  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	876/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	529/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	566/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	281/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	643/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	167/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	570/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1022/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	231/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	221/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	751/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	352/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	482/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	481/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	541/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	718/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	718/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0203  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1400  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	876/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	529/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	566/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	281/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	643/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	167/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	570/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1022/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	347/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	834/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	1294/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	795/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	541/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	718/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	718/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0203  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1401  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	876/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	529/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	566/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	281/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	643/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	167/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	570/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1022/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	531/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	772/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1163/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	816/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	595/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	541/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	718/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	718/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: STO DOMINGO, MA  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1402  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	9	2	3.45	1551/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	9	5	3.75	1409/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	5	6	5	3.40	1308/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	1055/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	7	3	4	3.22	1419/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	9	6	4.00	899/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	6	6	0	2.94	1550/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	2.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1352/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	5	4	9	3.90	1493/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	5	10	1	3.30	1449/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	7	4	3.30	1432/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	4	0	2	9	2	3.29	1110/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	3	3	3.38	1149/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	7	3	1	3.15	1284/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	1266/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	110/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	105/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	83/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	53/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	174/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	18				





Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1442/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1470/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1057/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	874/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1535/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1152/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1293/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1312/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1347/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1459/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1473/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	1234/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	996/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	860/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1110/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0303  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: STO DOMINGO, MA  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1404  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	929/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	465/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	471/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	646/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	0	8	3.56	1252/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	706/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	406/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	910/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	521/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	855/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	610/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	679/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	560/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	0	2	1	7	3.33	1171/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1117/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	2	1	10	4.13	931/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	619/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	198/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	147/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	188/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	200/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	121/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	12	
			? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1405  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	1	1	8	4	3.69	1478/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1048/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	980/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1188/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	1098/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	997/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1055/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1112/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	877/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	640/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	829/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	776/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	987/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	288/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	340/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	842/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1039/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	815/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	3	1	0	3	3	3.20	217/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	183/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	220/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	193/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	3.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	201/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1405  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1406  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	1	1	8	4	3.69	1478/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1048/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	980/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1188/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	1098/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	997/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1055/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1112/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	2	1	7	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	1294/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1345/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1244/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	842/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	340/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	842/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1039/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	815/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	3	1	0	3	3	3.20	217/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	183/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	220/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	193/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	3.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	201/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1406  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1407  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	1	1	8	4	3.69	1478/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1048/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	980/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1188/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	1098/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	997/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1055/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1112/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1347/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	1403/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	1376/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1377/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1379/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1167/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	340/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	842/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1039/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	815/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	3	1	0	3	3	3.20	217/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	183/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	220/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	193/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	3.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	201/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****



Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1407  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8621  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1408  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1358/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	719/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	423/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	559/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	504/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	637/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1092/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	911/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	900/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	919/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	641/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	608/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1064/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	942/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	761/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8621  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1408  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8621  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1409  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1358/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	719/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	423/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	559/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	504/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	953/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1280/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	1376/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	987/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	871/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	608/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1064/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	942/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	761/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8621  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1409  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8621  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1410  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1358/1670	4.06	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	719/1666	4.19	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	423/1406	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	559/1566	3.82	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	504/1528	4.24	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1650	4.15	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1279/1667	4.53	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	971/1559	4.22	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	911/1560	4.42	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	488/1549	4.10	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	795/1546	4.04	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	857/1323	3.84	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	608/1384	3.98	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1064/1378	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	942/1378	4.13	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	761/ 904	3.72	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	3.50	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	3.97	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	3.78	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	3.91	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	3.41	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8621  
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1410  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 333 0101  
 Title LAUGHTER AND HUMOR (SS)  
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1411  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	1128/1670	4.14	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	10	4.23	1003/1666	4.23	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	6	4.05	1033/1406	4.05	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	6	5	3	3.56	1430/1615	3.56	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	491/1566	4.41	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	5	3	3.05	1444/1528	3.05	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	675/1667	4.91	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	843/1626	4.15	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	11	5	3.95	1316/1559	3.95	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	699/1560	4.86	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	8	7	3.95	1191/1549	3.95	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	4	10	4.09	1106/1546	4.09	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	11	6	4.05	677/1323	4.05	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	6	4	3	3.40	1141/1384	3.40	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	1074/1378	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	1070/1378	3.86	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	22
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		13
			? 1		
				Other	1

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



Course-Section: PSYC 335 0101  
 Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO  
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN  
 Enrollment: 89  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1412  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	7	14	4.30	953/1670	4.30	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	15	4.48	654/1666	4.48	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	8	15	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	687/1615	4.41	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	9	11	4.04	881/1528	4.04	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	263/1650	4.77	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	11	4.42	1236/1667	4.42	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	9	12	4.27	716/1626	4.27	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	221/1559	4.93	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	725/1560	4.85	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	574/1549	4.59	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	17	4.41	849/1546	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	6	4	16	4.30	514/1323	4.30	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	940/1384	3.89	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	740/1378	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	856/1378	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	11	23	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	11	22	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	13	20	4.44	667/1406	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	11	19	4.44	450/1566	4.44	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1170/1528	3.72	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	9	26	4.69	327/1650	4.69	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	17	18	4.47	1186/1667	4.47	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	14	14	4.18	820/1626	4.18	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	33	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	10	23	4.65	512/1549	4.65	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	28	4.72	445/1546	4.72	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	5	9	19	4.29	522/1323	4.29	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	6	7	8	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	683/1378	4.43	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	541/1378	4.65	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	2	0	6	4	3	3.40	761/ 904	3.40	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 13						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C 7	General	5	Under-grad	37	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	23	
?	0			

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101  
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1414  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	7	47	4.84	271/1670	4.84	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	14	41	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	10	46	46	4.82	247/1406	4.82	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	5	17	30	4.48	579/1615	4.48	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	9	9	35	4.34	559/1566	4.34	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	11	17	25	4.16	787/1528	4.16	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	8	17	30	4.36	782/1650	4.36	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	4	50	4.93	540/1667	4.93	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	17	39	4.70	255/1626	4.70	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	5	48	4.84	387/1559	4.84	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	56	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	52	4.93	161/1549	4.93	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	1	52	4.94	139/1546	4.94	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	5	9	37	4.58	288/1323	4.58	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	5	8	24	4.51	427/1384	4.51	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.51
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	3	6	28	4.68	473/1378	4.68	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	323/1378	4.86	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	23	8	9	2	4	3	11	3.17	807/ 904	3.17	3.80	4.03	4.03	3.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 23
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 4	General 11	Under-grad 60 Non-major 37
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 12	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 26	
			? 3		

Course-Section: PSYC 345 0101  
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH  
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1415  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	2	10	24	4.54	621/1670	4.54	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	8	26	4.62	465/1666	4.62	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	10	23	4.49	620/1406	4.49	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	33	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1615	****	4.16	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	11	18	4.24	653/1566	4.24	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1528	****	4.09	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	9	25	4.59	443/1650	4.59	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	10	21	4.49	435/1626	4.49	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	291/1559	4.89	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	27	4.68	475/1549	4.68	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	29	4.76	407/1546	4.76	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	3	9	22	4.56	299/1323	4.56	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	9	7	16	4.15	749/1384	4.15	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	1	5	25	4.55	571/1378	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	3	3	26	4.61	590/1378	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	7	31	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----		-----		-----		-----		-----		-----		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	33
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	17							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General		17	Under-grad	40	Non-major	7
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	13	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		17				
				?	1							

Course-Section: PSYC 356 0101  
 Title PSYC OF SEX AND GENDER  
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1416  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	2	5	12	9	3.90	1351/1670	3.90	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	4	7	7	10	3.72	1424/1666	3.72	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	5	8	10	3.72	1218/1406	3.72	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	6	7	14	4.10	1028/1615	4.10	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	1	8	4	11	3.61	1230/1566	3.61	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	1	2	3	2	8	3.88	1063/1528	3.88	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	6	7	15	4.21	962/1650	4.21	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	270/1667	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	9	9	8	3.85	1172/1626	3.85	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	3	23	4.62	739/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	5	23	4.69	1066/1560	4.69	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	6	19	4.45	762/1549	4.45	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	11	13	4.21	1025/1546	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	1	6	20	4.57	288/1323	4.57	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	664/1384	4.27	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	17	7	3	1	2	0	2	2.63	862/ 904	2.63	3.80	4.03	4.03	2.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 16		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 2		
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: PSYC 360 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI  
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1417  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	6	9	6	6	3.36	1578/1670	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	6	12	7	1	3.12	1595/1666	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	8	8	4	4	2.93	1367/1406	3.87	4.33	4.32	4.22	2.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	20	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/1615	4.71	4.16	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	5	9	9	0	2.92	1506/1566	3.79	4.03	4.07	4.04	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	22	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1528	4.75	4.09	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	2	7	6	11	4.00	1135/1650	4.26	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	5	9	10	4.21	1402/1667	4.25	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	5	2	7	8	0	2.82	1572/1626	3.71	4.00	4.11	4.06	2.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	739/1559	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	1205/1560	4.73	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	8	6	9	3.70	1332/1549	4.23	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	5	3	8	10	3.78	1285/1546	4.32	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	4	3	3	7	5	3.27	1117/1323	3.95	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	3	5	5	5	3.29	1191/1384	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	3	6	5	4	3.19	1276/1378	4.07	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	5	4	5	4	3.10	1301/1378	4.02	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 904	4.43	3.80	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 10	General 2	Under-grad 30	Non-major 13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	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 18		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 360 8620  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI  
 Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1418  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	300/1670	4.08	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	428/1666	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	261/1406	3.87	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	302/1566	3.79	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	3	0	15	4.53	541/1650	4.26	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1334/1667	4.25	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	324/1626	3.71	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	435/1559	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	596/1560	4.73	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	352/1549	4.23	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	288/1546	4.32	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	266/1323	3.95	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	169/1384	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	122/1378	4.07	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	141/1378	4.02	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	279/ 904	4.43	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 24	Non-major 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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 11		
				? 0			



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	7	22	28	31	3.94	1292/1670	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	5	12	18	29	24	3.63	1470/1666	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	13	10	32	30	3.86	1153/1406	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.22	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	6	15	19	19	14	3.27	1526/1615	3.78	4.16	4.24	4.18	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	11	20	25	29	3.78	1122/1566	4.16	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	21	11	22	16	14	2.89	1477/1528	3.59	4.09	4.12	4.07	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	3	9	21	53	4.40	720/1650	4.53	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	3	83	4.93	472/1667	4.88	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	3	3	25	29	19	3.73	1268/1626	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.06	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	6	19	26	33	3.89	1360/1559	4.31	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	18	68	4.75	948/1560	4.53	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	7	12	22	23	23	3.49	1393/1549	3.85	4.25	4.31	4.25	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	7	15	20	39	3.94	1194/1546	4.08	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	9	3	10	28	30	3.84	871/1323	4.23	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	8	6	10	10	15	3.37	1158/1384	3.89	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	6	9	16	11	8	3.12	1289/1378	3.71	4.29	4.29	4.30	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	4	11	11	15	9	3.28	1270/1378	3.88	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.28
4. Were special techniques successful	41	40	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	****/ 904	4.33	3.80	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	87	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	87	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	88	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	88	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	88	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	88	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors	4	Graduate 0	Major	60
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 35					
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 17	C 10	General	5	Under-grad 90	Non-major	30
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 15	D 3					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	62			



Course-Section: PSYC 370 8620  
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1420  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	1162/1670	4.02	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	344/1666	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	576/1406	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	849/1615	3.78	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	379/1566	4.16	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	3	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	679/1528	3.59	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	361/1650	4.53	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	823/1667	4.88	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	584/1626	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	555/1559	4.31	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	2	2	13	4.32	1390/1560	4.53	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	1010/1549	3.85	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	1017/1546	4.08	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	254/1323	4.23	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	530/1384	3.89	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	836/1378	3.71	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	682/1378	3.88	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 230	****	3.99	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 231	****	3.88	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 370 8620  
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1420  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102  
 Title PERSONALITY  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1421  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	325/1670	4.89	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	4	12	38	4.58	516/1666	4.79	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	2	0	1	13	39	4.58	515/1406	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	8	2	4	4	8	29	4.23	898/1615	4.23	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	2	3	4	11	33	4.32	569/1566	4.66	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	4	8	15	20	3.69	1192/1528	4.34	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	6	2	6	17	22	3.89	1288/1650	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.12	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	3	51	4.94	405/1667	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	13	41	4.73	231/1626	4.73	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	3	3	4	45	4.65	689/1559	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	2	52	4.93	477/1560	4.96	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	8	42	4.60	562/1549	4.80	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	3	49	4.82	333/1546	4.91	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	16	5	3	6	8	17	3.74	922/1323	4.37	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	4	5	22	4.58	384/1384	4.79	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	348/1378	4.90	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	312/1378	4.94	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	32	17	5	0	3	3	2	2.77	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 20	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 24
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 25			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 13	Under-grad 62	Non-major 38
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D 1			
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 30		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 380 8620  
 Title PERSONALITY  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1422  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	4.89	4.19	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.79	4.16	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	4.66	4.03	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.34	4.09	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	4.97	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	4.96	4.65	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.80	4.25	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.91	4.23	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.37	4.13	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.79	4.01	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.90	4.29	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.94	4.32	4.31	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101  
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL  
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1423  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	16	4.42	794/1670	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	622/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	8	14	4.33	799/1406	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	826/1566	4.40	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	490/1528	4.57	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	208/1650	4.70	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	607/1667	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	605/1626	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	323/1559	4.66	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	298/1560	4.93	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	229/1549	4.81	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	21	4.75	407/1546	4.71	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	294/1323	4.64	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	498/1384	4.60	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	797/1378	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	531/1378	4.71	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	860/ 904	3.46	3.80	4.03	4.03	2.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 2	Under-grad 24	Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	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 13		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	1	0	3	5	22	4.52	654/1670	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	0	2	6	22	4.55	569/1666	4.52	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	18	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	306/1406	4.55	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	2	1	0	4	23	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	226/1566	4.40	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	24	4.69	285/1528	4.57	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	0	1	3	24	4.57	485/1650	4.70	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1667	4.96	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	0	1	9	10	4.29	693/1626	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	4	5	21	4.45	959/1559	4.66	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	0	30	4.90	596/1560	4.93	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	0	4	26	4.74	381/1549	4.81	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	4	25	4.68	507/1546	4.71	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	0	1	2	24	4.71	205/1323	4.64	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	2	24	4.75	257/1384	4.60	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	327/1378	4.58	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	24	4.75	439/1378	4.71	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	2	2	7	12	4.26	367/ 904	3.46	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.26
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 1	Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 38	Non-major 23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0		
				P 0			

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



I	0	Other	8
?	1		

Course-Section: PSYC 387 0101  
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1425  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	19	4.62	544/1670	4.62	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	428/1666	4.65	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	411/1406	4.68	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	245/1615	4.80	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	218/1566	4.77	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	277/1528	4.69	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	563/1626	4.40	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	371/1559	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	646/1549	4.54	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	679/1546	4.54	4.23	4.32	4.24	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	431/1323	4.39	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	243/1378	4.90	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	169/1378	4.95	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	275/ 904	4.44	3.80	4.03	4.03	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	10
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

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

Course-Section: PSYC 393A 0101  
 Title PSYCHOLOGY PEER HEALTH  
 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1426  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1670	4.89	4.19	4.31	4.24	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1615	4.88	4.16	4.24	4.18	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.03	4.07	4.04	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.09	4.12	4.07	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1650	4.89	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	854/1626	4.14	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.25	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1323	4.80	4.13	4.00	3.99	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.01	4.10	4.12	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.80	4.03	4.03	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.75	4.19	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 393F 8620  
 Title FORENSICS  
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1427  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1430/1670	3.78	4.19	4.31	4.24	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	3	1	1	1	3	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1406	****	4.33	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	3	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1593/1615	2.83	4.16	4.24	4.18	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1322/1566	3.44	4.03	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	1306/1528	3.44	4.09	4.12	4.07	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.10	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	712/1667	4.89	4.68	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1626	****	4.00	4.11	4.06	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.65	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1087/1549	4.13	4.25	4.31	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1293/1546	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.24	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	960/1323	3.67	4.13	4.00	3.99	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1070/1384	3.57	4.01	4.10	4.12	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	842/1378	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	731/1378	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	3	0	1	1	2	2.86	849/ 904	2.86	3.80	4.03	4.03	2.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 400 0101  
 Title SEM IN DEVELOPMENTL PS  
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1428  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	556/1666	4.56	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	240/1406	4.83	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.16	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.13	4.00	4.10	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	651/1384	4.29	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.29	4.29	4.55	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.32	4.31	4.60	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	865/ 904	2.50	3.80	4.03	4.22	2.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	3.87	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 407 0101  
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1429  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	784/1666	4.40	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	387/1406	4.70	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.16	4.24	4.37	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	8	6	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	7	4	3.60	1233/1528	3.60	4.09	4.12	4.26	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	7	7	2	3.59	1354/1626	3.59	4.00	4.11	4.28	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	689/1559	4.65	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	1054/1560	4.70	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	762/1549	4.45	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	3	4	9	3.89	827/1323	3.89	4.13	4.00	4.10	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	519/1384	4.43	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	548/1378	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.55	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	731/1378	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.60	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	648/ 904	3.71	3.80	4.03	4.22	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 20 Non-major 3
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1430  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1125/1666	4.11	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1018/1615	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.37	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	520/1566	4.38	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1548/1650	3.22	4.10	4.22	4.28	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1052/1559	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	852/1549	4.38	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	570/1546	4.63	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1323	****	4.13	4.00	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.55	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 904	4.14	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	65/ 87	4.50	3.87	4.65	4.80	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	47/ 79	4.75	4.08	4.64	4.60	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	46/ 75	4.63	4.09	4.57	4.56	4.63	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	50/ 79	4.38	3.49	4.45	4.53	4.38	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	51/ 80	3.75	2.69	3.97	3.67	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 440 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL PSYC  
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1431  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	388/1670	4.62	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	833/1666	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1057/1406	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	633/1615	4.16	4.16	4.24	4.37	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	137/1566	4.82	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	368/1528	4.65	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	690/1650	4.27	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.68	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	387/1626	4.26	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	307/1559	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	622/1549	4.47	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	283/1323	4.11	4.13	4.00	4.10	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	3	1	9	3.88	944/1384	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.32	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	751/1378	4.60	4.29	4.29	4.55	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	937/1378	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.60	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	317/ 904	4.51	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PSYC 440 8620  
 Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL PSYC  
 Instructor: GRIFFITH, JIM  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1432  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	665/1670	4.62	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1092/1666	4.26	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	597/1406	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1252/1615	4.16	4.16	4.24	4.37	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	226/1566	4.82	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.65	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1055/1650	4.27	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.94	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	953/1626	4.26	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	896/1559	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1248/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	852/1549	4.47	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	980/1323	4.11	4.13	4.00	4.10	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	434/1384	4.19	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.60	4.29	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	179/ 904	4.51	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 446 0101  
 Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1433  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	735/1666	4.44	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	656/1406	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	357/1615	4.69	4.16	4.24	4.37	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	315/1528	4.64	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.86	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	555/1559	4.73	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	699/1560	4.87	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	979/1546	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.13	4.00	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	651/1384	4.29	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.29	4.29	4.55	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.32	4.31	4.60	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	4.83	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	13				
				? 1						

Course-Section: PSYC 448 8620  
 Title DEVELOPMNTL NEUROSCIEN  
 Instructor: NEWMAN, JULIE  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1434  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1406	4.88	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.16	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.03	4.07	4.17	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.10	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	265/1546	4.88	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	260/1323	4.63	4.13	4.00	4.10	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PSYC 463 8620  
 Title EATING: NORMAL/ABNORMA  
 Instructor: SHANDLER, MELVI  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1435  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	414/1670	4.71	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	363/1406	4.71	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.16	4.24	4.37	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	470/1566	4.43	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.71	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	1032/1650	4.14	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.68	4.67	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1559	4.71	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.65	4.72	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	288/1323	4.57	4.13	4.00	4.10	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.32	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101  
 Title ADVANCED TPCS:PARENTIN  
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1436  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.19	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.48	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	263/1615	4.79	4.16	4.24	4.37	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	92/1566	4.93	4.03	4.07	4.17	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.09	4.12	4.26	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1650	4.93	4.10	4.22	4.28	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	10	2	3.93	1583/1667	3.93	4.68	4.67	4.73	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	231/1626	4.73	4.00	4.11	4.28	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	141/1549	4.93	4.25	4.31	4.43	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	156/1323	4.80	4.13	4.00	4.10	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.01	4.10	4.32	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.29	4.29	4.55	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.89	4.32	4.31	4.60	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	433/ 904	4.13	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 17	Non-major 5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	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 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101  
 Title SEM:VERBAL BEHAVIOR  
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1437  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1003/1666	4.22	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	364/1566	4.56	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	831/1626	4.17	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1482/1559	3.40	4.38	4.46	4.49	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1560	4.60	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1365/1549	3.60	4.25	4.31	4.37	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1452/1546	3.20	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1082/1323	3.40	4.13	4.00	4.03	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	940/1384	3.89	4.01	4.10	4.21	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	942/1378	4.11	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	437/ 904	4.11	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.11
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	70/ 87	4.20	3.87	4.65	4.61	4.20
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	62/ 79	4.33	4.08	4.64	4.67	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	52/ 79	4.33	3.49	4.45	4.58	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601B 0101  
 Title CORE II  
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1438  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1148/1666	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1301/1406	3.43	4.33	4.32	4.36	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1033/1615	4.09	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	349/1566	4.58	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	1481/1650	3.45	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	910/1626	4.08	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	586/1549	4.58	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1384	4.91	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	218/1378	4.92	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601C 0101  
 Title CORE II  
 Instructor: HUEBNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1439  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	206/1670	4.91	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	833/1666	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	853/1528	4.08	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	1436/1650	3.58	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	339/1626	4.58	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	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 4	Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			



Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101  
 Title LONGITUDINAL DATA ANAL  
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1440  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1487/1666	3.57	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.33	4.32	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1544/1615	3.20	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1560/1566	1.86	4.03	4.07	4.20	1.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1245/1528	3.57	4.09	4.12	4.33	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1615/1650	2.67	4.10	4.22	4.30	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.00	4.11	4.20	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1477/1559	3.43	4.38	4.46	4.49	3.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1453/1549	3.29	4.25	4.31	4.37	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1309/1546	3.71	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1259/1323	2.67	4.13	4.00	4.03	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.01	4.10	4.21	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.29	4.29	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.32	4.31	4.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601E 0101  
 Title COMMUNITY SOCIAL TOPIC  
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1441  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.16	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.09	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.10	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1092/1559	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1376/1560	4.33	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.13	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1033/1384	3.67	4.01	4.10	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601F 0101  
 Title PHYSIOLOGICAL SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: GLASGOW, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1442  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	831/1626	4.17	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1382/1559	3.83	4.38	4.46	4.49	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.13	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1033/1384	3.67	4.01	4.10	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 0101  
 Title AGGRESSION/DISRUPTV BE  
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1443  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	545/1323	4.25	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	878/ 904	2.00	3.80	4.03	4.04	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 8620  
 Title METH. & ASSMT. IN IO PS  
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1444  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	1	0	3.00	1620/1670	3.00	4.19	4.31	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1350/1666	3.86	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1222/1406	3.71	4.33	4.32	4.36	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1393/1566	3.29	4.03	4.07	4.20	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.09	4.12	4.33	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1494/1650	3.43	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1347/1667	4.29	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1534/1626	3.00	4.00	4.11	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1559	3.83	4.38	4.46	4.49	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1560	4.50	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1549	3.67	4.25	4.31	4.37	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	4.10	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	****	4.13	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.00	4.01	4.10	4.21	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1275/1378	3.20	4.29	4.29	4.42	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	4.32	4.31	4.51	3.40

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	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 8620  
 Title METH.& ASSMT. IN IO PS  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1445  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	1	0	3.00	1620/1670	3.00	4.19	4.31	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1350/1666	3.86	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1222/1406	3.71	4.33	4.32	4.36	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1393/1566	3.29	4.03	4.07	4.20	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.09	4.12	4.33	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1494/1650	3.43	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1347/1667	4.29	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1534/1626	3.00	4.00	4.11	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1382/1559	3.83	4.38	4.46	4.49	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1345/1549	3.67	4.25	4.31	4.37	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1032/1546	4.10	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.00	4.01	4.10	4.21	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1275/1378	3.20	4.29	4.29	4.42	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1230/1378	3.40	4.32	4.31	4.51	3.40

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	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601I 8620  
 Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL PSYC  
 Instructor: GRIFFITH, JIM  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1446  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	210/1566	4.78	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	823/1528	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1067/1650	4.11	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	795/1546	4.44	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	564/1378	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	621/1378	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	194/ 904	4.63	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	53/ 87	4.80	3.87	4.65	4.61	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	62/ 79	4.33	4.08	4.64	4.67	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 75	4.75	4.09	4.57	4.66	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	50/ 79	4.40	3.49	4.45	4.58	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	49/ 80	3.80	2.69	3.97	4.32	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 4 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 7 Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601J 8620  
 Title ORG BEHAVIOR MANAGEMEN  
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1447  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1330/1650	3.80	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	239/1626	4.71	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1549	4.90	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	231/1546	4.90	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1323	4.80	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1384	4.89	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.89	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.61	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.66	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	Major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major 10
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

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



Course-Section: PSYC 616 0101  
 Title MEAS APPL BEHAV AN  
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1448  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	290/1670	4.81	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	686/1666	4.47	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	644/1406	4.46	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	181/1566	4.81	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	769/1528	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	485/1650	4.56	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	231/1626	4.73	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	419/1559	4.81	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	463/1549	4.69	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	808/1546	4.44	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	1	5	8	4.06	670/1323	4.06	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	274/1378	4.88	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	511/1378	4.69	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1449  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1442/1670	3.75	4.19	4.31	4.46	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1527/1566	2.75	4.03	4.07	4.20	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1152/1528	3.75	4.09	4.12	4.33	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	1647/1650	1.25	4.10	4.22	4.30	1.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1608/1626	2.25	4.00	4.11	4.20	2.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1549/1559	2.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1514/1549	2.75	4.25	4.31	4.37	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1523/1546	2.50	4.23	4.32	4.40	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	1317/1323	1.25	4.13	4.00	4.03	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	4.01	4.10	4.21	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1139/1378	3.67	4.29	4.29	4.42	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.80	4.03	4.04	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 622 0101  
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN I  
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1450  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	948/1406	4.17	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1325/1615	3.75	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.13	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	3.80	4.03	4.04	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	0	Graduate	6	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	0	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	5				
				? 0						

Course-Section: PSYC 650 0101  
 Title CHILD CLINICL PSYCHOLO  
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1451  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1337/1666	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.33	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1252/1615	3.88	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	771/1566	4.13	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	823/1528	4.13	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626	4.14	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1365/1559	3.88	4.38	4.46	4.49	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	879/1546	4.38	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1143/1323	3.20	4.13	4.00	4.03	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	777/1384	4.13	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1378	4.88	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 5 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4 Under-grad 3 Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 2		

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

Course-Section: PSYC 665 0101  
 Title ADVSEM:DRUGS AND BEHAV  
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1452  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	751/1406	4.38	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1325/1615	3.75	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	480/1566	4.42	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1528	****	4.09	4.12	4.33	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1278/1650	3.91	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	1124/1626	3.91	4.00	4.11	4.20	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	1053/1549	4.17	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1040/1546	4.18	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	304/1323	4.55	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1223/1384	3.18	4.01	4.10	4.21	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	4	0	6	3.91	1057/1378	3.91	4.29	4.29	4.42	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	627/1378	4.55	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 686 0101  
 Title ETHICAL & PRO ISSUES  
 Instructor: BARNETT, JEFF  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1453  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	835/1670	4.38	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	378/1666	4.69	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	483/1406	4.62	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	520/1615	4.54	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1068/1566	3.85	4.03	4.07	4.20	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	844/1650	4.31	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1191/1626	3.83	4.00	4.11	4.20	3.83
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1122/1559	4.31	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	751/1560	4.85	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	936/1549	4.31	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1113/1546	4.08	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1245/1323	2.78	4.13	4.00	4.03	2.78
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1009/1384	3.73	4.01	4.10	4.21	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	935/1378	4.09	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	904/1378	4.18	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.18

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 695A 0101  
 Title SEM:DIVERSITY  
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1454  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	2.00	1663/1670	2.00	4.19	4.31	4.46	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	0	0	2.11	1656/1666	2.11	4.16	4.27	4.34	2.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.33	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	1	0	2.33	1606/1615	2.33	4.16	4.24	4.33	2.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	2.89	1515/1566	2.89	4.03	4.07	4.20	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	1.89	1521/1528	1.89	4.09	4.12	4.33	1.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	1	1	2	2.78	1609/1650	2.78	4.10	4.22	4.30	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	2	4	1	0	2.44	1598/1626	2.44	4.00	4.11	4.20	2.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1532/1559	2.75	4.38	4.46	4.49	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1541/1560	3.25	4.65	4.72	4.81	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	2.00	1534/1549	2.00	4.25	4.31	4.37	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	0	0	2.13	1532/1546	2.13	4.23	4.32	4.40	2.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	4.57	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	1319/1384	2.71	4.01	4.10	4.21	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1304/1378	3.00	4.32	4.31	4.51	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	865/ 904	2.50	3.80	4.03	4.04	2.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 695B 0101  
 Title NEUROPSYCHOLOGY  
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1455  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.33	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	272/1615	4.78	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1566	4.89	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1067/1650	4.11	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1629/1667	3.78	4.68	4.67	4.74	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	363/1626	4.56	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	337/1549	4.78	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.78	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	****	4.13	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.29	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	3.87	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.08	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.09	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	3.49	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.69	3.97	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PSYC 710 0101  
 Title RESEARCH METHODS  
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1456  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1344/1670	3.90	4.19	4.31	4.46	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1348/1566	3.40	4.03	4.07	4.20	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1172/1626	3.86	4.00	4.11	4.20	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1461/1560	4.10	4.65	4.72	4.81	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	936/1549	4.30	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1313/1546	3.70	4.23	4.32	4.40	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	448/1323	4.38	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1378	4.88	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 711 0101  
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROCED I  
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1457  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.19	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	173/1666	4.91	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	254/1406	4.82	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	317/1615	4.73	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	167/1528	4.82	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	675/1667	4.91	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1626	4.91	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	276/1559	4.91	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	284/1549	4.82	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	333/1546	4.82	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1323	4.89	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	883/1378	4.22	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	160/ 904	4.71	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.71

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 711L 0101  
 Title DATA ANALY. PROCED. II  
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1458  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	531/1670	4.63	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.16	4.24	4.33	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.25	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.80	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	32/ 232	4.80	3.75	4.19	4.30	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 239	4.80	4.02	4.21	4.53	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	3.99	4.44	4.69	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 231	4.80	3.88	4.31	4.58	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 218	****	3.41	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: PSYC 741 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN BEH MED  
 Instructor: BEDI AKO, SHAWN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1459  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	0	2	0	2.29	1659/1670	2.29	4.19	4.31	4.46	2.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	1652/1666	2.29	4.16	4.27	4.34	2.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1610/1615	2.17	4.16	4.24	4.33	2.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1562/1566	1.50	4.03	4.07	4.20	1.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	0	1	0	1.67	1523/1528	1.67	4.09	4.12	4.33	1.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1646/1650	1.33	4.10	4.22	4.30	1.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1648/1667	3.50	4.68	4.67	4.74	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	1567/1626	2.86	4.00	4.11	4.20	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1559	****	4.38	4.46	4.49	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1560	****	4.65	4.72	4.81	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1549	****	4.25	4.31	4.37	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1546	****	4.23	4.32	4.40	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1319/1384	2.71	4.01	4.10	4.21	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1125/1378	3.71	4.29	4.29	4.42	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	878/ 904	2.00	3.80	4.03	4.04	2.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	1	4	1	0	1	2.43	86/ 87	2.43	3.87	4.65	4.61	2.43
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	77/ 79	3.00	4.08	4.64	4.67	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	75/ 75	2.80	4.09	4.57	4.66	2.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	0	1	1	2.57	78/ 79	2.57	3.49	4.45	4.58	2.57
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	1.71	79/ 80	1.71	2.69	3.97	4.32	1.71

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	7	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	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	6				
				? 1						

Course-Section: PSYC 782 0101  
 Title READING/READING DISABI  
 Instructor: BAKER, LINDA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1460  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.19	4.31	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1350/1666	3.86	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.16	4.24	4.33	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	354/1566	4.57	4.03	4.07	4.20	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.09	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1494/1650	3.43	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1104/1667	4.57	4.68	4.67	4.74	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.00	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.65	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.25	4.31	4.37	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.23	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1384	4.14	4.01	4.10	4.21	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.29	4.29	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	926/1378	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.51	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.80	4.03	4.04	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	72/ 87	4.14	3.87	4.65	4.61	4.14
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	69/ 79	4.00	4.08	4.64	4.67	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	56/ 75	4.17	4.09	4.57	4.66	4.17
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	54/ 79	4.29	3.49	4.45	4.58	4.29
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	66/ 80	3.17	2.69	3.97	4.32	3.17

Frequency Distribution

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