Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

IIII IN TO FOICHOLD

Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J

Enrollment: 197
Questionnaires: 107

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1303 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Freq		ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	3	0	0	1	1 /	28	<i>c</i> 1	1 12	742/1576	4.29	4 04	4.30	4.11	1 12
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	3	0	1	1	14 8	28 24	61 70	4.43	555/1576	4.29	4.24 4.19	4.30	4.11	4.43 4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	<i>5</i>	0	0	4	6	22	70	4.55	541/1342	4.26	4.19	4.27	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	23	0	6	11	19	44	4.26	848/1520		4.17	4.32	4.19	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	23 1	4	5	4	27	61	4.25	562/1465	4.04	4.17	4.25	4.09	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	41	2	1	11	16	31	4.33	748/1434	4.20	4.09	4.12	3.94	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	41	2	5	10	28	51 59	4.20	774/1547	4.01	4.18	4.14	4.10	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	2	1	26	72	4.52	911/1574	4.52	4.16	4.19	4.10	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	0	8	35	39	4.38	571/1554	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.01	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	U	U	0	33	39	4.30	5/1/1554	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.01	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	4	18	76	4.71	610/1488	4.61	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	15	83	4.78	849/1493	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.65	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	6	19	74	4.69	437/1486	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.26	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	6	6	18	68	4.41	813/1489	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.22	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	3	1	10	24	57	4.38	429/1277	4.35	4.03	4.03	3.91	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	68	0	5	1	6	9	18	3.87	910/1279	3.82	4.08	4.17	3.96	3.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	0	1	6	7	25	4.44	706/1270	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	1	0	4	4	30	4.59	596/1269	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	68	16	3	2	3	2	13		****/ 878	4.15	3.86	4.05	3.91	****
Laboratory	105	-	-	0	0	•	0	1 00	***** / 024	ale ale ale ale	4 00	4 00	4 00	ale ale ale ale
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	105	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.29	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	105	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	105	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	***	4.33	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	105	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	105	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	106	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	106	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	106	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced	105	0	-1	0	0	1	0	0 50	****/ 40		F 00	4 60	1 11	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	105	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 40 ****/ 24	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	105	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 24 ****/ 25	****	4.67 ****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	105	0	0		-	1	1		****/ 35	****		4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	105	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	105	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/ 382	^ ^ ^ *	5.00	4.08	3.86	^^^

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J

Enrollment: 197
Questionnaires: 107

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1303 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	29	0.00-0.99	2	 А	47	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	В	37						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	16	C	9	General	14	Under-grad	107	Non-major	100
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30	_			
				?	1						

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 198 Questionnaires: 115

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1304 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	5	19	31	55	4.15	1050/1576	4.29	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	23	30	51	4.07	1094/1576	4.31	4.19	4.27	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	6	22	29	49	3.97	1000/1342	4.26	4.17	4.32	4.19	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	31	2	10	20	19	31	3.82	1225/1520	4.04	4.17	4.25	4.09	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	4	18	29	55	4.21	688/1465	4.28	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		59	2	7	13	9	23	3.81	1057/1434	4.01	4.09	4.14	3.94	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	7	7	26	28	45		1182/1547	4.09	4.18	4.19	4.10	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	1	64	45		1227/1574		4.67	4.64	4.59	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	6	26	45	18	3.76	1159/1554	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.01	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	13	15	80		858/1488	4.61		4.47	4.41	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	13	27	69		1240/1493	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.65	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	4	11	32	61	4.30		4.49	4.28	4.32	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	6	10	13	24	57		1091/1489	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.22	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	3	5	12	21	64	4.31	480/1277	4.35	4.03	4.03	3.91	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	64	0	4	0	18	11	18	3.76		3.82	4.08	4.17	3.96	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	63	0	1	2	14	10	25	4.08	910/1270	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	2	1	13	7	28	4.14	,	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	64	12	1	2	5	13	18	4.15	420/ 878	4.15	3.86	4.05	3.91	4.15
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	108	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14		****	4.19	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	108	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	,	****	4.44	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	109	2	1	0	1	2	0		****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	108	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	109	1	0	1	1	2	1		****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	109	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	,	****	4.54	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	110	2	0	0	3	0	0		****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	110 110	1 2	0	1	1 2	1 1	1		****/ 80 ****/ 375	****	4.37	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	110	2	U	U	2	1	0	3.33	^^^^/ 3/5	***	4.61	4.01	3.78	^^^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	110	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	,	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	110	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20		***	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	110 111	1	0	1	1	2	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	***		4.03	3.64	^^^
Self Paced				_		_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00		****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	112	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	***	4.67	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	111	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	112	1 1	0	1 2	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28 ****/ 382	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	112	Τ	U	۷	U	U	U	∠.00	****/ 382	^^^	5.00	4.08	3.86	

Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN

Enrollment: 198
Questionnaires: 115

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1304 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	dits Earned		A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	0	Α	37	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	45						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	10	C	8	General	15	Under-grad	114	Non-major	111
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	30	=			
				?	2						

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J

Emmallment: 01

Enrollment: 81
Questionnaires: 60

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1305 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	13	39	4.69	387/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	4	12	37	4.56	542/1576	4.39	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	5	16	32	4.46	633/1342	4.25	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	11	0	1	4	13	24	4.43	648/1520	4.12	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	5	8	38	4.53	353/1465	4.37	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	8	2	2	7	12	23	4.13	806/1434		4.09	4.14	4.06	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	4	9	40	4.63	387/1547	4.52	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	0	10	43	4.76	758/1574	4.77	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	1	1	15	24	4.43	504/1554	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	15	34	4.55	822/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	6	45	4.83	759/1493	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	-	16	33	4.54	642/1486	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	11	36	4.52	684/1489		4.26	4.32	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	4	15		4.57	278/1277	4.47		4.03	4.01	
5. Did addition bad teething the four anderbeataing	,	Ü	O	Ü	-		J 1	1.57	27071277	1.1/	1.05	1.05	1.01	1.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	3	3	24	4.70	312/1279	4.32	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	326/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	278/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	30	3	0	2	1	10	14	4.33	322/ 878	4.28	3.86	4.05	3.92	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01		****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	3,7	O	O	O	U	O	_	3.00	, 313		1.01	1.01	1.21	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced		•				•	_	- 0-	,		- 06		- 06	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Δ	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	60	Non-major	46
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

P 1 responses to be significant I 0 Other 24 ? 0

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID

Enrollment: 91
Questionnaires: 48

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1306 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Ouestions				quer		s			ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	13	29	4.46	712/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	13	29	4.51	594/1576	4.39	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	17	26	4.43	683/1342	4.25	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	3	9	10	14	3.89	1172/1520	4.12	4.17	4.25	4.26	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	37	4.65	277/1465	4.37	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	4	4	6	10	9	3.48	1215/1434	3.73	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	13	32	4.58	434/1547	4.52	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	15	30	4.55	1041/1574	4.77	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	3	17	18	4.33	623/1554	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	43	4.83	355/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	42	4.85	683/1493	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	12	34	4.67	468/1486	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	12	32	4.54	649/1489	4.43	4.26	4.32		4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	5	9	32	4.46	356/1277	4.47	4.03	4.03	4.01	
Discussion														
	26	0	0	0	_	4	1 2	1 20	E00/1070	4 20	4 00	4 1 7	1 1 1	1 26
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	5	4	13	4.36	582/1279	4.32	4.08	4.17	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	636/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	590/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	26	4	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	383/ 878	4.28	3.86	4.05	3.92	4.22
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ā	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	 А	18	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	18						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	48	Non-major	29
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	2						

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R

Enrollment:

60 Questionnaires: 59

Page 1307 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eauei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General				_	_			4 00	000/4556			4 00	4 0=	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	19	0	0	3	6	8	23	4.28	928/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	19	0	0	2	6	18	14		1076/1576	4.39	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	2	2	11 7	10	15		1089/1342	4.25	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	2	2	2	7	8	18		1031/1520	4.12	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	5		9	17	3.92		4.37	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	19	2	4	4	5	16	9		1181/1434	3.73	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	0	3	4	9	24	4.35	737/1547	4.52		4.19	4.22	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	0 1	0 1	0	0 7	0 13	39	5.00	1/1574	4.77		4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	1	Т	3	/	13	9	3.79	1145/1554	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.05	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	4	12	23	4.43	970/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	2	4	34	4.80	810/1493	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	3	3	11	23	4.35	871/1486	4.52		4.32	4.29	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	3	5	12	20	4.22	976/1489	4.43		4.32	4.31	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	0	2	2	1	8	26	4.38	421/1277	4.47	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	2	6	7	13	3.90	899/1279	4.32	4.08	4.17	4.14	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	2	5	4	19	4.33	784/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	4	5	20	4.47	677/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	30	17	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	****/ 878	4.28	3.86	4.05	3.92	****
T. Character and														
Laboratory		0	^	^	1	1	0	2 50	****/ O10	****	4 10	4 25	4 47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.47	****
<ol> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> </ol>	56 57	2 1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229 ****/ 232	****	4.44	4.51	4.65 4.38	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5 /	1	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	***/ 232		4.44	4.29	4.38	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 375	****		4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****
Colf Darad														
Self Paced	F 77	0	0	0	-	^	-1	4 00	++++/ ^^	****	F 00	4 60	F 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57 57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57 57	1 1	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24 ****/ 35	****	4.67 ****	4.83 4.67	5.00 5.00	****
<ol> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> </ol>	57 57	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57 56	0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 382	****	5.00	4.78	4.39	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	U	U	U	4	Т	U	3.33	/ 382		5.00	4.08	4.39	

Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS

Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1307 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	В	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	6	Under-grad	59	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	-			
				?	0						

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

Instructor:

Enrollment: 100 Questionnaires: 68

Baltimore County Spring 2009 BORRERO, JOHN

Page 1308 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire
-------------	----------------	---------------

University of Maryland

							Fre	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1 Did vo	nı dəin ne	ew insights,sk		om this course	0	0	0	1	3	19	45	4.59	527/1576	4.45	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.59
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	9	57	4.81	222/1576	4.69	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.81
		estions refle			0	0	0	0	3	9	56	4.78	275/1342	4.64	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.78
	_	ations reflect			0	33	0	0	4	10	21	4.49	545/1520	4.50	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.49
				what you learned	2	1	9	3	11	14	28		1102/1465	3.86	4.17	4.12	4.09	3.75
	_			_			0	1			⊿o 9							****
		-		to what you learned	3	49	0	0	2	4			****/1434	4.31	4.09	4.14	4.06	
		g system clear		inea	3	0	-	-	0	6	59	4.91		4.86	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.91
	-	was class can			2	0	0	0	0	4	62	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.94
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	10	1	2	0	0	11	44	4.67	263/1554	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.67
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	60	4.91	248/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.91
		ctor seem inte			2	0	0	0	0	2	64	4.97	223/1493	4.96	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.97
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	12	51	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.75
		es contribute			3	0	0	0	0	10	55	4.85	263/1489	4.85	4.26	4.32		4.85
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	2	8	56	4.82	,	4.73	4.03	4.03		4.82
o. Dia at	laiovisuai	r tecimiques ei	illiance y	our understanding	۷	U	U	U	۷	0	50	4.02	129/12//	4.73	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.02
		Discus	ssion															
				what you learned	37	0	0	0	4	8	19	4.48	466/1279	4.44	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.48
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively e	ncourage	ed to participate	37	0	0	0	4	0	27	4.74	424/1270	4.61	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.74
				nd open discussion	37	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	575/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.61
4. Were s	special te	echniques succ	essful	-	37	16	3	1	1	3	7	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	3.92	****
		Semina	ar															
1. Were a	assianed t			announced theme	66	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.78	****
				lividual attention	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.54	4.69	4.72	****
		for grading made			65	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 375	****	4.61		4.21	****
J. Wele C	illella l	or grading mad	de Clear	•	05	_	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	/ 3/3		4.01	4.01	4.21	
		Field																
5. Did co	onferences	s help you car:	ry out f	field activities	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	there enou	agh proctors fo	or all t	the students	66	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****
				Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_	1			3										
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A 31		Red	 guire	ed f	or Ma	aior	`====	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	37
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В 23										-	-	) (	-	
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C 3		Cer	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 6	8	Non-	-major	31
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	15	D 0		GCI	icia.	-				J	onaci -g.	Luu 0	0	14011		J±
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	Б 0 F 0		, רים	ectiv	700				3	#### - 1	Moana +	horo o	ro not	- onous	h
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	0			ьIе	=CLT,	ves				٥					_	11
				P 0		a						7	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	11	
				I 0		Oth	ner				4	7						

? 0

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S

Enrollment: 99
Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1309 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	7	22	24	4.32	871/1576	4.45	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	16	34	4.57	528/1576	4.69	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	10	36	4.51	583/1342	4.64	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	499/1520	4.50	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	5	7	13	24	3.96	905/1465	3.86	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	36	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	614/1434	4.31	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	44	4.81	179/1547	4.86	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	50	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	5	26	13	4.07	892/1554	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	49	4.94	334/1493	4.96	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	40	4.75	352/1486	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	45	4.85	263/1489	4.85	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	3	11	34	4.65	229/1277	4.73	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	0	0	7	16	4.40	554/1279	4.44	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	656/1270	4.61	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	527/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	29	19	0	0	1	1	4		****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	3.92	****
Cominan														
Seminar	F 2	0	^	0	-	0	^	2 00	**** / 27F		1 (1	4 01	4 01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	Τ	U	U	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	16	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	54	Non-major	31
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	36	-			
				2	2						

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: ARNHEIM, DANIEL

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 48

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

9

84-150

Grad.

85

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1310 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	1	3	14	10	20	3.94	1213/1576	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.94
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	1	12	17	17	4.00	1138/1576	4.21	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	12	28	4.35	753/1342	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.35
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	8	2	3	6	4	24	4.15	953/1520	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.15
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	2	1	3	4	6	32	4.41	498/1465	4.16	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.41
				to what you learned	0	3	5	4	12	3	21	3.69	1132/1434	3.82	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.69
		g system clearl			1	0	1	5	6	12	23		985/1547		4.18	4.19	4.22	4.09
		was class cand			1	9	0	0	0	10			795/1574				4.62	
				ching effectiveness	15	5	1	0	9	14			1194/1554					
		Lectur	~e															
1 Were +	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	3	0	0	2	11	9	23	4 1º	1165/1488	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.18
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	4	6	8	27		1344/1493		4.67		4.75	4.29
				explained clearly	3	0	0	2	9	14	20		1032/1486		4.28	4.73	4.73	4.16
		es contribute t			3	7	1	1	5	11			948/1489					
				your understanding	4	0	2	3	4	13	20 22				4.26	4.32	4.31	
o. Did au	.aiovisuai	r techniques en	mance :	your understanding	4	U	2	3	4	13	22	4.14	630/1277	4.36	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.14
		Discus																
				what you learned	15	0	8	4	6	9	6	3.03	1182/1279		4.08	4.17	4.14	3.03
				ed to participate	15	0	7	5	9	3	9	3.06	1203/1270	3.60	4.33	4.35	4.30	3.06
				nd open discussion	15	0	5	7	6	7	8		1191/1269		4.33	4.35	4.29	3.18
l. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	essful		15	23	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	****/ 878	3.07	3.86	4.05	3.92	****
		Labora	atory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	ate bac	kground information	46	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.47	****
		Semina	ar															
. Were a	ssigned t	copics relevant	to the	e announced theme	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.78	****
. Was th	e instruc	ctor available	for in	dividual attention	45	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.72	***
. Did re	search pr	rojects contrib	oute to	what you learned	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.83	***
	_	ons contribute		_	46	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.80	***
		for grading mad			46	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01		****
				Frequ	ency	, Dis	trib	utic	n									
7		G G		_	-					_			_				M =	
Credits E 	arnea	Cum. GPA	· ·	Expected Grades				K∈ 	ason	.s 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 24		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`s	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	в 13														
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C 0		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 4	18	Non-	-major	42
0/1_150	2	2 00-2 40	7	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

28

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

0

0

F

Ρ

Ι

?

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201 University of Maryland

Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 38

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1311 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	es		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	1	7	13	11	4.06	1112/1576	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	8	11	12		1100/1576		4.19	4.27	4.32	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	4	6	6	16		1010/1342		4.17	4.32	4.41	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	8	9	15	4.12	977/1520	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	3	4	12	12	3.97	905/1465	4.16	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	4	5	8	13	3.81	1057/1434	3.82	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	4	13	16	4.36	727/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	527/1574	4.86	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	10	13	4	3.78	1152/1554	4.02	4.01	4.10	4.05	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	666/1488	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	1089/1493	4.60	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	5	9	19	4.42	792/1486	4.36	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	9	7	17	4.24	962/1489	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	3	4	8	15	4.17	608/1277	4.36	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	7	10	4.00	802/1279	3.80	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	2	5	4	11	3.96	967/1270	3.60	4.33	4.35	4.30	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	793/1269	3.83	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	3	1	6	0	4	3.07	795/ 878	3.07	3.86	4.05	3.92	3.07
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 8 0.00-0.99 1 A 10		Red	guir	 ed f		 Ia ior		7	 Graduat		0	Majo		14

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	38	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301 Title

ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: RESTA, PETER Enrollment: 80

Questionnaires: 43

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1312 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	2	0	4	5	27	4.45	727/1576	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	3	7	26	4.57	528/1576	4.21	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	0	2	4	29	4.67	406/1342	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	5	1	3	4	3	20	4.23	891/1520	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	2	2	4	10	17	4.09	808/1465	4.16	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	1	8	7	15	3.97	928/1434	3.82	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	5	3	28	4.64	375/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	141/1574	4.86	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	347/1554	4.02	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	2	3	29	4.71	589/1488	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	658/1493	4.60	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	5	4	25	4.51	666/1486	4.36	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	3	29	4.64	539/1489	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	2	0	2	30	4.76	154/1277	4.36	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	589/1279	3.80	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	3	0	2	1	8		1041/1270	3.60	4.33	4.35	4.30	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	2	1	1	1	9	4.00	928/1269	3.83	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	30	6	2	0	1	2	2		****/ 878	3.07	3.86	4.05	3.92	****
1. Here appearat deciminates autocomplain	30	Ü	_	3	_	_	_	3.23	, 0,0	3.07	3.00	2.03	3.72	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	23	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 91 Questionnaires: 47

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1313 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

					Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
	in new insights,skills fr		4	0	1	1	3	13	25	4.40	797/1576		4.24	4.30	4.30	4.40
	structor make clear the e	_	4	0	1	0	1	17	24	4.47	668/1576		4.19	4.27	4.28	4.47
	am questions reflect the	_	4	0	2	0	4	11	26	4.37			4.17	4.32	4.30	4.37
	evaluations reflect the e	_	4	20	2	1	2	4	14	4.17			4.17	4.25	4.25	4.17
_	ed readings contribute to	_	4	1	1	2	2	13	24	4.36	554/1465		4.08	4.12	4.09	4.36
	n assignments contribute	-	4	27 0	3 1	0 1	0	2	11	4.13			4.09	4.14	4.15	4.13
_	ading system clearly expl imes was class cancelled	.ained	4	0	0	0	2 1	21	36 21	4.67	327/1547 1128/1574		4.18 4.67	4.19	4.21 4.61	4.67
-	you grade the overall tea	ahina offoativonoaa	13	1	0	1	7	12	13	4.12			4.01	4.10	4.01	4.12
9. HOW WOULD S	you grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	13	Τ	U	1	/	12	13	4.12	049/1334	4.12	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.12
	Lecture															
1. Were the in	nstructor's lectures well	prepared	5	0	1	0	1	6	34	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did the ins	structor seem interested	in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	4	35	4.76	908/1493	4.76	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.76
3. Was lecture	e material presented and	explained clearly	6	0	1	1	3	7	29	4.51	666/1486	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.51
4. Did the led	ctures contribute to what	you learned	6	0	2	0	3	8	28	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovi	isual techniques enhance	your understanding	7	0	2	0	3	8	27	4.45	366/1277	4.45	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.45
	Discussion															
1 Did class o	discussions contribute to	what you learned	27	0	3	2	4	3	R	3 55	1043/1279	3.55	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.55
	tudents actively encourage	_	27	0	3	1	3	3	10		1033/1270		4.33	4.35	4.42	3.80
	structor encourage fair a		27	0	1	3	2	5	9	3.90	,		4.33	4.35	4.41	3.90
	al techniques successful	and open argoappion	27	13	0	1	0	0	6		****/ 878		3.86	4.05	4.09	****
-	-															
	Laboratory															
2. Were you pr	rovided with adequate bac	kground information	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
	Seminar															
1. Were assign	ned topics relevant to th	e announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
_	structor available for in		44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,		4.54	4.69	4.69	****
	ch projects contribute to		44	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 72		4.71	4.64	4.53	****
	tations contribute to wha	_	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criter	ria for grading made clea	ir	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****
1 5:3 6:13 .	Field Work		10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 52	++++	++++	4.48	4 27	++++
i. Dia liela e	experience contribute to	what you learned	46	0	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/ 52	***	* * * * *	4.48	4.37	
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-pa	aced system contribute to	what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
_																
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned	d Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13			quir					3	 Graduat		 0	Majo		18
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 16					quir	eu I	OT M	ajor	Ö	3	Graduat	E	U	Ma J	) L	Τ0
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 5 C 5					nera	1			1	.3	Under-g	rad 4	47	Non-	-major	29
84-150 10	3.00-3.49 6	D 0									5				3	
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	jh
	Р 0										respons	es to b	oe sigr	nificar	nt	

Other

Ι

?

0

0

17

Course-Section: PSYC 306 0101 University of Maryland Title LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVELOP

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 106 Ouestionnaires: 65

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1314 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 3 5 19 35 4.39 808/1576 4.39 4.24 4.30 4.30 4.39 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 3 5 19 35 4.39 808/1576 4.39 4.24 4.30 4.30 4.39 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 3 6 17 36 4.39 785/1576 4.39 4.19 4.27 4.28 4.39 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 0 1 3 7 13 38 4.35 753/1342 4.35 4.17 4.32 4.30 4.35 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 37 1 2 4 6 11 4.00 1041/1520 4.00 4.17 4.25 4.25 4.00

5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 3 2 16 39 4.46 439/1465 4.46 4.08 4.12 4.09 4.46 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 47 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 \*\*\*\*/1434 \*\*\*\* 4.09 4.14 4.15 \*\*\*\* 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 1 0 6 19 34 4.42 673/1547 4.42 4.18 4.19 4.21 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 1 0 0 0 32 27 4.46 1140/1574 4.46 4.67 4.64 4.61 4.46 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 0 1 0 10 24 16 4.06 897/1554 4.06 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.06

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 2 0 5 15 40 4.47 920/1488 4.47 4.39 4.47 4.47 4.47 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 1 1 9 51 4.77 868/1493 4.77 4.67 4.73 4.70 4.77 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 3 16 40 4.48 706/1486 4.48 4.28 4.32 4.32 4.48 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 2 2 5 12 40 4.41 813/1489 4.41 4.26 4.32 4.34 4.41 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 2 0 6 14 37 4.42 385/1277 4.42 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.42

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 37 0 1 10 3 10 3.50 1064/1279 3.50 4.08 4.17 4.20 3.50 37 0 3 12 2 10 3.61 1116/1270 3.61 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.61 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 37 0 2 3 7 3 13 3.79 1025/1269 3.79 4.33 4.35 4.41 3.79 38 18 4 0 1 2 2 2.78 \*\*\*\*/ 878 \*\*\*\* 3.86 4.05 4.09 \*\*\*\*

4. Were special techniques successful

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	27						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	11	General	14	Under-grad	65	Non-major	55
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	35	_			
				?	2						

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment:

100 Questionnaires: 60 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1315 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Centeral				Frequencies				Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect	
Ceneral	Ouestions	NR	NA		_			5		_		_			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did with revaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did with the assignments contribute to what you learned 8. Did with the standard system clearly explained 9. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 to 1 to 1 to 2 to 2	~~~~~														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 2 7 13 36 4.37 78/1776 4.37 4.19 4.27 4.28 4.37 1.01 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 2 7 13 36 4.37 64/194 4.46 4.17 4.32 4.30 4.34 4.5 1.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 21 3 1 6 7 21 4.11 99/15/20 4.11 4.17 4.25 4.25 4.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 38 3 2 2 2 11 3.80 105/31/34 3.80 4.09 4.14 4.15 3.80 7.80 many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 1 0 4 12 0 10 4.53 482/15/4 4.19 4.08 4.19 4.20 4.25 4.18 1.9 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.14 4.15 3.80 7.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	18	36	4.49	652/1576	4.49	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How could you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to material 9. When pencial techniques successful resident of the pencial techniques successful resident your provided with adequate background information 9. How the pencial techniques successful resident your provided with adequate background information 9. When necessary materials available for lab activities 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 9. Were necessary material as valiable for lab activities 9. Were provided to the successful	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	13	36	4.37	798/1576	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lecture 1. Were the instructor's lecture well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lecture well prepared 2. 0 1 1 2 27 16 4.26 702/1554 4.26 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.26 2. 10 1 2 27 16 4.26 702/1554 4.26 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.26 2. 11 2 27 16 4.26 702/1554 4.26 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.26 3. 12 2 2 1 1 4 4.26 702/1554 4.26 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.26 3. 13 2 2 2 1 1 4 4.26 702/1554 4.26 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.26 4. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's eneminatested in the subject 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	10	40	4.46	646/1342	4.46	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1 0 1 2 27 16 4.26 702/1554 4.19 4.67 4.64 4.61 4.19  1. Hecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2. Did the instructor selectures well prepared 3. 0 1 3 0 1 2 4 1 4.56 798/1488 4.56 4.39 4.47 4.57 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Were all students actively exposinged to participate 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 7. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 8. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8. Did the lab instructor available for consultation 8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9. Did projects relevant to the announced theme 9. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9. Did projects helpf	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	3	1	6	7	21	4.11	994/1520	4.11	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 1 4 12 40 4.52 492/1547 4.53 4.18 4.19 4.21 4.53 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 1 0 43 4.19 1367/1574 4.19 4.67 4.64 4.61 4.19 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1 0 1 2 27 16 4.26 702/1554 4.26 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.26  Lecture 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 53 4.19 1367/164 6.19 4.07 4.77 4.77 4.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 53 4.19 501/1493 4.91 4.67 4.64 4.26 4.32 4.32 4.34 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 1 1 16 40 4.64 539/1489 4.64 4.28 4.32 4.32 4.54 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0 1 5 12 36 4.54 293/1277 4.54 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.54  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 7 0 0 3 7 3 20 4.21 697/1279 4.21 4.08 4.17 4.20 4.21 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.42 391 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.21 4. Were special techniques successful 27 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.21 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 234 **** 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.54  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 239 *** 4.44 4.51 4.46 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 239 *** 4.44 4.51 4.46 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 239 *** 4.33 4.24 4.64 5. Were the instructor provide for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 5.00 ***/ 79 *** 4.44 4.51 4.46 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 45 *** 4.44 4.54 4.54 4.54 4.54 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 45 *** 4.44 4.54 4.54 4.54 5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ***/ 45 *** 4.44 4.5	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	5	15	31	4.19	708/1465	4.19	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 1 0 0 1 2 2 7 16 4.26 702/1574 4.19 4.67 4.64 4.61 4.19 4.09 4.26   Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 3 0 12 41 4.56 798/1488 4.56 4.39 4.47 4.47 4.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 5 53 4.91 501/1493 4.91 4.67 4.73 4.70 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 1 4 11 40 4.54 631/1486 4.54 4.28 4.32 4.32 4.54 4. Bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 1 16 4 11 40 4.54 631/1486 4.54 4.28 4.32 4.34 4.54 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0 1 5 12 36 4.54 293/1277 4.54 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.54   Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 3 7 3 20 4.21 697/1279 4.21 4.08 4.17 4.20 4.21   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27 0 1 0 8 5 18 3.91 1006/1270 3.91 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27 0 1 0 8 5 18 4.51 840/1259 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.21   4. Were special techniques successful 27 1 5 4 1 3 1 9 3.56 698/878 3.56 3.66 4.05 4.09 3.56    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 58 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 **** 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 **** 4.03 4.03 4.04 **** 4.03 4.03 4.04 **** 4.03 4.03 4.04 **** 4.03 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	38	3	2	2	2	11	3.80	1063/1434	3.80	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.80
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   13   1   0   1   2   27   16   4.26   702/1554   4.26   4.01   4.10   4.09   4.26	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	12	40	4.53	492/1547	4.53	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.53
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 53 4.91 501/1493 4.91 4.67 4.74 4.74 4.56 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 5 53 4.91 501/1493 4.91 4.67 4.73 4.70 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 1 4 11 40 4.54 631/1486 4.54 4.28 4.22 4.22 4.54 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 5 12 36 4.54 293/1277 4.54 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.54 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0 1 5 12 36 4.54 293/1277 4.54 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.54  Discussion  1. Did class discussion contribute to what you learned 2 7 0 0 3 7 3 20 4.21 697/1279 4.21 4.08 4.17 4.20 4.21 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 7 0 3 1 8 5 16 3.91 1006/1270 3.91 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 7 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.91 4. Were special techniques successful 2 7 15 4 1 3 1 9 3.56 698/878 3.56 3.86 4.05 4.09 3.56  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 232 *** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 237 ** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 4. Did the lab instructor variable for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 85 *** 4.71 4.72 4.67 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 85 *** 4.71 4.72 4.67 **** 6. Did gradient for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/ 85 *** 4.71 4.72 4.67 **** 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 23 *** 4.74 4.40 4.92 4.16 **** 7. Did green quiderstand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 2.33 ***/ 5 *** 4.71 4.72 4.67 **** 8. Did you clearly understand your evalua	8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	43	13	4.19	1367/1574	4.19	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.19
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared   3	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	2	27	16	4.26	702/1554	4.26	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.26
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared   3	Tashiina														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 4.91 501/1493 4.91 4.67 4.73 4.70 4.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 1 4 11 40 4.54 631/1486 4.54 4.28 4.32 4.32 4.54 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 1 1 16 40 4.64 539/1489 4.64 4.26 4.32 4.34 4.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0 1 5 12 36 4.54 2393/1277 4.54 4.03 4.03 4.13 4.54    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 5 12 36 4.54 2393/1277 4.54 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.54    Discussion 2 0 0 0 2 7 3 2 0 4.21 697/1279 4.21 4.08 4.17 4.20 4.21    3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 7 0 1 0 8 6 18 2.11 106/1270 3.91 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.91    3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 7 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.91    4. Were special techniques successful 2 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.03 4.05 4.09 3.56    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 0.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.03 4.34 4.24 ****  2. Were your provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 0.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 0.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.19 4.16 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0.00 ****/ 339 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 0.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.34 4.69 4.69 4.69 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 0.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 ****  4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 0.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.67 4.63 4.89 ****  5. Did you clearly under		2	Λ	1	2	Λ	1 2	11	1 56	700/1/00	1 56	1 20	1 17	1 17	1 56
3 Nas lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 Variable lectures (1.5 Laboratory) 1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 Variable lectures (2 Variable lectures) 2 Variable lectures (2 Variable lectures) 2 Variable lectures (2 Variable lectures) 3 Variable lectures) 3 Variable lectures (2 Variable lectures) 4 Variable lectures) 4 Variable lectures (2 Variable lectures) 4 Variable lectures) 4 Variable lectures (2 Variable lectures) 4 Variable lectures) 5 Variable lectures) 6 Variable lectures) 7 Variable lectures) 8 Variab						-									
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 2 0 0 1 5 12 36 4.54 293/1277 4.54 4.03 4.03 4.13 4.54 5.54 5.54 5.55 5.55 5.55 5.55 5.5	<del>-</del>		-	-	-	-	-								
Discussion  Discus															
Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  Discussion  Did the lab instructor encourage fair and open discussion  Did the lab increase understanding of the material  Did the lab instructor provide assistance  Did the lab instructor available for individual attention  Did research projects contribute to what you learned  Did presentations contribute to what you learned  Did greacent projects contribute to what you learned  Did field experience contribute to what you learned  Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  Mas the instructor available for consultation  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  Did se	<del>-</del>					_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 0 3 7 7 3 20 4.21 697/1279 4.21 4.08 4.17 4.20 4.21 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 27 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.21 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	5. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	4	4	U		5	12	30	4.54	293/12//	4.54	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27 0 3 1 1 8 5 16 3.91 1006/1270 3.91 4.33 4.35 4.42 3.91 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.21 4.18 4.19 4.19 4.15 4.15 4.19	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27 0 1 0 8 6 18 4.21 840/1269 4.21 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.21 4.00 Were special techniques successful 27 15 4 1 3 1 9 3.56 698/878 3.56 3.86 4.05 4.09 3.56   Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 240 **** 4.19 4.35 4.32 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.61 4.22 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 5.00 ****/ 379 ****/ 379 ****/ 379 ****/ 379 ****/ 379 ****/ 379 ****/ 379 ****/ 379 ***/ 379 ***/ 379 *	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	3	7	3	20	4.21	697/1279	4.21	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.21
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  56 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  56 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 240 **** 4.19 4.35 4.32 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  58 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.71 4.72 4.67 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  58 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 3.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  58 0 0 0 0 1 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.44 4.29 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  57 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.51 4.64 4.53 ****  5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  58 0 0 0 0 1 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.41 4.22 ****  5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  58 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  59 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 46 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  58 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  58 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the instructor helpful  58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	3	1	8	5	16	3.91	1006/1270	3.91	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.91
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 240 **** 4.19 4.35 4.32 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.71 4.72 4.67 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.37 4.61 4.22 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 48 **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.57 4.50 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.40 3.92 ****  5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.73 4.63 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** 4.73 4.63 4.89 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 5.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 25 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  4. W	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	8	6	18	4.21	840/1269	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.21
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ****/ 240 **** 4.19 4.35 4.32 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.34 4.20 4.17 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.48 4.37 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.48 4.37 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4. Were special techniques successful	27	15	4	1	3	1	9	3.56	698/ 878	3.56	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.56
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 234 **** 4.03 4.23 4.24 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ****/ 240 **** 4.19 4.35 4.32 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.14 4.51 4.48 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 **** 5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.71 4.72 4.67 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 ****/ 48 **** 4.48 4.37 **** 4.70 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.73 4.63 **** 4.70 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 **** 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** / 240 **** 4.19 4.35 4.32 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 229 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 85 **** 4.71 4.72 4.67 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 72 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 80 **** 4.37 4.61 4.22 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 **** / 52 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 **** / 52 **** 4.44 4.95 4.69 4.69 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 2.33 **** / 52 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 **** / 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** / 36 **** **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** / 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** / 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 28 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****		ГС	2	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 22/	++++	4 02	4 22	1 01	++++
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 229 **** 4.44 4.51 4.48 **** 4.01 the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.16 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.29 4.17 **** 5.00 4.41 4.51 4.51 4.61 4.01 4.12 **** 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.41 4.51 4.52 **** 5.00 4.41 4.51 4.52 **** 5.00 4.41 4.51 4.52 **** 5.00 4.41 4.51 4.51 4.51 4.51 4.51 4.51 4.51				-				_		, -					
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 4.44 4.29 4.16 ****  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 56 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 ****  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** **** 4.57 4.50 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Wes the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****				-		-	_	_							
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 379 **** 4.33 4.20 4.17 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 37 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.71 4.72 4.67 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did gield experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 ****							-								
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	-					-	-	_		, -					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 85 **** 4.71 4.72 4.67 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 72 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 72 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** 75 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 **** 75 **** 4.61 4	J. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	50	J	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 3/2		1.33	4.20	4.17	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4.69 4.69 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.71 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.37 4.61 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****	Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.37 4.64 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.37 4.61 4.22 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 *** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.67 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****	-	57	1	0		0	0	2	5.00	,	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 57 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.37 4.61 4.22 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 57 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 4.57 4.50 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****				•		-	-	_		,					
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 0 0 0 0 1 2.33 **** 4.61 4.01 4.12 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 **** **** 4.57 4.53 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** 4.57 4.50 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 45 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****				0		0	0	2	5.00	, . –	****	4.71	4.64		
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** **** 4.57 4.50 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****	-						-	_		,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 **** 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** **** 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****    Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 *** 4.67 4.83 4.89 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 *** 5.00 4.78 5.00 **** 4.00 **** 4.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 4.00 **** 5.00	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 57 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 **** 52 **** **** 4.48 4.37 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** **** 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****    Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 **** 4.00 **** 4.00 **** 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 4.00 **** 5.	Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 58 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 48 **** **** 4.40 3.92 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** **** 4.57 4.50 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 *** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ***  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 *** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 *** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****		57	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 44 **** **** 4.73 4.63 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 45 **** *** 4.57 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****    Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 35 **** **** 4.67 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****	-									, -	****	****			****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.57 4.50 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 57 1 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** **** 4.03 4.23 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.67 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****						-				,	****	****			****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 326 **** 4.03 4.23 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** 4.67 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****							•			,	****	****			****
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 *** 4.67 4.83 4.89 ***  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 35 *** *** 4.67 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 *** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****							-			, -					****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 40 *** 5.00 4.60 4.83 *** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 *** 4.67 4.83 4.89 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 35 *** *** 4.67 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 *** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****	5. 214 conferences here you carry out from detryffies	5,	_	J	J	_	J	_	1.00	, 520			1.05	1.23	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 58 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 **** 24 **** 4.67 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 35 *** *** 4.67 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 *** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.67 5.00 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****										, 10					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 58 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** 5.00 4.78 5.00 ****										,					
3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						-	-	_		, 55					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 58 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 382 **** 5.00 4.08 4.24 ****										,					
	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	***

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING

Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN

Enrollment: 100
Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1315 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	22	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	10	General	17	Under-grad	60	Non-major	29
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 308 8620 University of Maryl Title CHILD MALTREATMENT Baltimore County Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1316 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	32			
Questionnaires:	31	Student Course E	Evaluation (	Questionnaire

										Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	4	4	22	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.60
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	434/1576		4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63
		uestions reflec			2	14	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1342		4.17	4.32	4.30	5.00
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	476/1520		4.17	4.25	4.25	4.53
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	244/1465		4.08	4.12	4.09	4.70
	_	-		o what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	24	4.67	270/1434		4.09	4.14	4.15	4.67
		g system clearl		2	1	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	375/1547		4.18	4.19	4.21	4.63
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1574		4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	463/1554		4.01	4.10	4.09	4.46
		Lectur																
1 Womo	the insta	uctor's lecture		nanarad	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	4 0	3	27	4.90	557/1493		4.67	4.47	4.47	4.90
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	468/1486		4.28	4.73	4.32	4.67
		_		1	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	660/1489		4.26	4.32	4.34	4.53	
	<ul> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin</li> </ul>				3	3	0	2	4	7	12	4.16	608/1277		4.03	4.03	4.11	
o. Dia	audiovisua	i teciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	3	3	U	4	7	,	12	4.10	000/12//	4.10	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.10
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	22	4.62	365/1279	4.62	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.62
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	541/1270	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.62
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	288/1269	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.90
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		2	5	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.33
	- Fre						trib	utio	n									
Credita	: Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	-								Ty	ne			Majors	
					es Reasons 							- Y					, 	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	4	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 5									_	_				
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 3	30	Non-	major	7
84-150	) 6	3.00-3.49	8	D 0														_
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0		0	#### - 1				_	ſh					
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sigr	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101 University of Maryl Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

43

University of Maryland Page 1317
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1124/1576	4.05	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.05
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	5	5	10		1113/1576		4.19	4.27	4.28	4.05
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	4	2	7	9		1020/1342		4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95
		uations reflect			0	0	0	2	4	7	9		1022/1520		4.17	4.25	4.25	4.05
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	4	10	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.00
				o what you learned	0	3	2	1	5	5	6	3.63	1157/1434	3.63	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.63
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	3	2	4	8	5	3.45	1363/1547	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.45
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	957/1574	4.64	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.64
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	1	2	6	6	1	3.25	1390/1554	3.25	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.43
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	1321/1493	4.33	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.33
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						1	2	3	3	11	4.05	1085/1486	4.05	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.05
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	2	2	3	5	9	3.81	856/1277	3.81	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.81
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	899/1279	3.91	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.91
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	763/1270	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.36
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	858/1269	4.18	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.18
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		11	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	•								Ty	ne			Majors	
					es Reasons 											, 		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3								_			_			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 7		Ge	nera:	L				3	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0					_									
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives				1	#### -				_	ıh			
				P 0		٥.,	,				_	2	respons	es to b	e sign	ıfıcan	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her				1	.3						

2

Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME

Instructor: FOX, MARY H

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1318 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	9	15	4.03	1136/1576	4.03	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	13	11	11		1248/1576	3.89	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	13	13	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	9	9	16	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	6	6	18	4.03	839/1465	4.03	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	8	9	12	3.79	1069/1434	3.79	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	2	9	10	11	3.69	1267/1547	3.69	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	23	9	4.17	1379/1574	4.17	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	7	9	12	4.10	871/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	10	11	14	4.11	1197/1488	4.11	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	27	4.71	1006/1493	4.71	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	9	11	13	4.03	1094/1486	4.03	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	9	7	17	4.18	1012/1489	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	5	1	3	2	8	3.37	1077/1277	3.37	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.37
Discussion				_		_		4 40	==4/40=0	4 4 4 4	4 00		4 00	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	774/1279	4.10	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	4	2	14	4.38	749/1270	4.38	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	632/1269	4.52	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.67
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	1	Λ	0	3 00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	U	J	U		U	U	3.00	/ 302		5.00	4.00	7.24	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 6	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	L	General	3	Under-grad	36	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	)						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	)	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P 0	)			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I O	)	Other	21	_			
				2 0	)						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 27

Page 1319 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	312/1576	4.74	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.74
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	489/1576	4.59	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.59
		estions reflect	_	9	0	0	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	531/1342	4.56	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.56
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	385/1520	4.62	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.62
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	0	1	0	2	2	7	15	4.35	562/1465	4.35	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.35
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	7	17	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.50
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explain	ied	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How ma:	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1202/1574	4.40	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.40
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	436/1554	4.48	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.48
		Lecture	<b>e</b>															
		ctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	99/1488	4.96	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.96
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.92
				lained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	231/1486	4.85	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.85
		s contribute to	_		1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	309/1489	4.81	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.81
5. Did au	diovisual	r understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	154/1277	4.76	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.76		
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ate to wh	at you learned	12	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.33
				to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	435/1270	4.73	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.73
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.80
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		12	5	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	660/ 878	3.70	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.70
		Field W	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out fie	eld activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits E				Rea	asons	S			Туј	pe			Majors	1				
00-27	0	 A 8		Pec	 nii re	ed fo	 or Ma			5	Graduat		0	 Мајо		15		
28-55	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	B 12		1/6	14116	-u 1(	/_ I*IC	ביינ ג	D	J	Graduati	_	U	Ma JO		10
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ger	neral					3	Under-q	rad 2	7	Non-	major	12
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D 0				-				-	011001 9			1.011		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0						Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 1										respons				_			
			I 0 Other								1	.4	-					
				. 0														

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 38

STAPLETON, LAUR 88

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1320 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
:	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	2	11	22	4.47	682/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.47
:	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	27	4.68	378/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.68
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	29	4.69	369/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.69
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	487/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.53
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	13	17	4.29	606/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.29
	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	6	9	16	4.32	604/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.32
	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	3	29	4.76	228/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.76
	8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	35	4.94	281/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.94
9	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	208/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.73
	Lecture														
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	463/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.77
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	810/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.80
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	484/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.66
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	378/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.76
!	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	278/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.57
	Discussion		•			_					4 00		4 4 5	4 00	4 0=
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	589/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.35
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	620/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.53
	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	375/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.81
4	4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	322/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.33
	Laboratory														
	Laboratory	20	0	-1	0	1	1	_	4 00	<b>++++</b> / 004	1	4 02	4 00	4 0 4	
	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	1	0	1	1	6		****/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	•	2	6		****/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	1	0	2	6		****/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	1 0	0	1	7		****/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	****
	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	4	U	U	U	1	4	4.80	****/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	* * * * *
	Seminar														
	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
	2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
	4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	***
										,					
	Field Work														
:	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
:	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
:	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
	Self Paced														
	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
	4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
!	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	****

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR

Enrollment: 88
Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1320 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101 Title

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: TALWAR, GITIKA

Enrollment: 88 Questionnaires: 5 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1321 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1148/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	3		1138/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	583/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	511/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1067/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	712/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1155/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4		1125/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1118/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00
Laboratory														
Laboratory	4	0	0	^	^	^	1	F 00	****/ 024	1	4 02	4 00	4 0 4	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240 ****/ 229	4.28 4.70	4.19 4.44	4.35 4.51	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	4	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 3/9	4./3	4.33	4.20	4.1/	* *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: SEMIATIN, JOSH

Enrollment: 88
Questionnaires: 22

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1322 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera	 1																
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	457/1	1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.64
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	434/1	1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.64
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	7	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	552/1	1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.53
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	7	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	579/1	1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.47
5. Did as:	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	5	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	347/1	1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.53
				o what you learned	3	5	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	498/1	1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.43
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	2	3	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	503/1	1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.53
8. How man	ny times v	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	866/1	1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.70
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	307/1	1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.62
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	736/1	1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.61
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	868/1	1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.78
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	251/1	1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.82
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	420/1	1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.72
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	9	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1020/1	1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.50
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	617/1	1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.32
				d to participate	3	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	666/1		4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.47
				d open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	519/1		4.20			4.41	4.68
		chniques succe	-	4	7	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	648/	878		3.86		4.09	3.73	
		Labora	torv																
1. Did the	e lab inc		_	f the material	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/	234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
				ground information	19	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/		4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
				or lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/		4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
		tructor provid			19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	232	4.71		4.29	4.16	****
				early specified	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	****
		Semina	r																
1. Were a	ssigned to			announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
				ividual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
				what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	72	****	4.71		4.53	****
		ns contribute			21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
		Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	ution	1												
	,		_			_						_				'			
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	sons	5 				Тур	oe 			Majors 	; 
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Grad	duate	2	0	Majo	or	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 1											, .				_
56-83							nera:	L				0	Unde	er-gr	rad 2	12	Non-	-major	7
84-150															_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		EΙ	ectiv	ves				0						enoug	ın
				P 0		0.1					_	_	resp	ponse	es to b	e sign	niticar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.5							
				? 1															

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1323 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
Gamana 1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	6	4	3 88	1266/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	298/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	511/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	4	0	4		1306/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	2	0		4.20	748/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4		4.63	387/1547	4.36		4.19	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	758/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	783/1554	4.10	4.01		4.09	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	638/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	784/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2		4.38	851/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4		4.63	552/1489	4.14		4.32	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	802/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	802/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	908/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	1	0			1076/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	69/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	***	****	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	****

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1323 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-	_		
				?	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1324 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1530/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	1	1	2	2.33	1572/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	2.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	4	0	2	1	2.27	1340/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	1491/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	2	2	2.75	1431/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1353/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	5	1	3.00	1459/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	2	2	1	0	2.00	1549/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	2	4	1	2.92	1461/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	2.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	0	5	0	4	3.17	1487/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	3.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	3	2	0	2.25	1480/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	2.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	2	2	0	2.00	1480/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	5	0	1	3	1	2.50	1238/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	1	2	1	2.55	1245/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	3	2	2	1	2.55	1247/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	2.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	1	1	3	1	2.45	1249/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	2.45
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	770/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	117/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	221/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	132/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	****
·									,					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	0						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Title

Instructor: METZGER, SHARI

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1325 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	712/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.45
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	215/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.82
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	819/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.27
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	683/1520	4.21	4.17		4.25	4.40
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	4		4.56	335/1465	3.88		4.12	4.09	4.56
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2		4.75	193/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.75
	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.50	527/1547	4.36	4.18		4.21	4.50
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.82
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	9		155/1554		4.01			4.82
۶.	now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	U	2	9	4.02	133/1334	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.02
	Lecture														
1		2	0	1	0	0	2	7	1 10	005/1400	1 26	4 20	1 17	1 17	4 40
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	2		4.40	995/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.40
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	966/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.73
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.80
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.73	420/1489	4.14		4.32	4.34	4.73
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.67
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	393/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.58
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	412/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.75
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	353/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.83
4.	Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	135/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.78
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.80
	Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	91/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.50
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	2	3		114/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.60
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	49/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.80
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	3	0	0	0	1		4.67	55/ 379	4.73	4.33		4.17	4.67
٥.	were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	U	5	U	U	U		2	1.07	33/ 3/3	1.73	1.55	1.20	1.1/	1.07
	Seminar														
1	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 85	****	1 71	4.72	4.67	****
				-	0	-	0	2		,	****				****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0		0			5.00		****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 72		4.71	4.64	4.53	
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.83	5.00
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 24	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.89	4.67
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00		4.24	5.00
٥.	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	_	J	3	3	,	3	3	2.00	1, 302	3.00	2.00	1.00		2.00

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I

Instructor: METZGER, SHARI

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1325 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101 University of Maryland Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 34

SS, Indias (India)

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1326 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	-	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	1119/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	631/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	11	13	4.03	834/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	15	4.31	614/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	9	16	4.25	838/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	1140/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	11	11	4	3.67	1227/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	7	7	13	3.90	1316/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	5	22		1142/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	6	5	8	9	3.45	1346/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	9	8	11	3.77	1247/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	8	3	5	6	4	2.81	1203/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	780/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	2	4	5	4	3	3.11	792/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05		3.11
Laboratory														
-	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 22/	2 00	4 02	4 22	1 21	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33 33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234 ****/ 240	3.80 4.10	4.03 4.19	4.23	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	4.10	4.19	4.55	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	4.37	4.44	4.29	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379	4.19	4.44	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	33	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 3/9	4.19	4.33	4.40	±.1/	.,

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30	
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	4	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enoug	h		
				Р 0				responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	26	_				
				2	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101 University of Maryland Title

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 34

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1327

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Ou a shi a sa	_		MD	<b>3.T.7</b>		eque:	ncie	S 4	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	; 		NR	NA	1 		3 		5 	Mean	Rank 	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	L															
1. Did you	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00				
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							3	6	10	13	4.03	1119/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.03
	_	estions reflect	_		2	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09
		ations reflect			2	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	631/1520		4.17	4.25	4.25	4.44
		eadings contribu			2	0	2	0	6	11	13	4.03	834/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	15	4.31	. , .	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.31
	_	g system clearly	-	ed	2	0	0	1	6 3	9	16	4.25	838/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.25
	-	was class cance			2	1 3	0	1	3 0	8 10	19 3		1140/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.45 3.84
9. HOW WOT	uia you g	grade the overal	li teachir	g effectiveness	17	3	U	Т	U	10	3	4.07	886/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well pre	pared	18	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	957/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested in t	he subject	18	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	1263/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.43
		erial presented			18	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38		3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.87
		es contribute to			18	0	1	1	4	5	5		1255/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.85
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance your	understanding	19	5	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.90
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.12
		nts actively end		-	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.44
		ctor encourage f			9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	780/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.32
		echniques succes			10	6	2	4	5	4	3	3.11		3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.11
		T - 1																
1 543 44	. 7 . 1	Laborat	-	Annual Control	2.2	0	0	0	0	_	1	F 00	4444/ 024	2 00	4 02	4 00	4 04	****
		crease understar		ne material ound information	33 33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234 ****/ 240	3.80 4.10	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
		materials avail			33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	4.10	4.19 4.44	4.35	4.48	****
	_	structor provide			33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		4.44	4.29	4.16	****
		its for lab repo			33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 379		4.33	4.20	4.17	****
J. Well I	equiremen	ich for tab repe	oren erear	I, ppccilica	33	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	_	3.00	, 313	1.17	1.33	1.20	1.17	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Re	 quire		 or M	aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		30
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 14		100	-1011	- u I	O1 11	۱۰ ر	~	•	Gradac	_	Ū	1100	-	30
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C 2		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad 3	4	Non-	-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								-		-, 0			,	=
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot!	her				2	16	_					
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101 University of Maryland
Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County

(Instr. C)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1328

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 41
Questionnaires: 34
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						_					_		<b>a</b>			- 1	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	encie 3		5	Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sec
Did wor	ı gəin ng	General	s from this course	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4 00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.0
			he expected goals	2	0	0	3	6	10	13		1119/1576		4.19	4.27	4.28	4.0
				2	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342		4.17	4.32	4.30	4.0
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							3	9	19	4.44			4.17	4.25	4.25	4.4
			e to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	11	13	4.03			4.08	4.12	4.09	4.0
	-	_	ute to what you learned		0	0	0	5	12	15		614/1434		4.09	4.14	4.15	4.3
		g system clearly o		2	0	0	1	6	9			838/1547		4.18	4.19	4.21	4.2
		was class cancell		2	1	0	1	3	8	19		1140/1574		4.67		4.61	
	-		teaching effectiveness		2	1	0	5	4			1405/1554		4.01		4.09	
			J														
Were th	ne instr	Lecture actor's lectures v	well prepared	23	0	0	1	4	3	2	3 73	1359/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.1
			ted in the subject	23	0	0	2	0	4	5		1402/1493			4.73	4.70	4.4
			and explained clearly	23	0	1	3	1	4			1384/1486		4.28	4.32	4.32	
		es contribute to v		23	0	3	0	1	4	3		1355/1489		4.26	4.32	4.34	
			nce your understanding	24	2	3		2	1	0		****/1277		4.03	4.03		
		-	-														
Did cla	aga diga	Discussions contribute	on e to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3 97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.1
			uraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270		4.33	4.35	4.42	4.4
			ir and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32			4.33	4.35	4.41	
		echniques successi	-	10	6	2	-	5	4	3	3.11	,			4.05		3.1
-		-															
-11.		Laborato				_								4 00	4 00		***
			ing of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234			4.23	4.24	
_	-	_	background information		0	0	0	0	0	Ţ		****/ 240		4.19	4.35	4.32	***
			ble for lab activities	33	0	0		0	0	1		****/ 229		4.44	4.51	4.48	***
		structor provide a		33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		4.44	4.29	4.16	***
. were re	equiremer	nts for lab report	ts clearly specified	33	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	
			Freq	uency	/ Dis	strik	outio	on									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	eason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 (	 O A 10		 Re	 eau i 1	red f	or M	 la ior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	30
28-55	5		0 B 14			1					-		-	-	) (	-	
56-83	7		5 C 2		Ge	enera	al				0	Under-g	rad 3	34	Non-	-major	4
84-150	5		4 D 0		50		_								011		_
Grad.	0		4 F 0		E	lect:	ives				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	gh
	-		P 0									respons				_	
			I O		Ot	her				2	26			5-			
			3 0							_							

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101 University of Maryland
Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 41

(Instr. D) Spring 2009

Questionnaires: 34 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Overation.	_		NID	Frequencies					_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4 	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	1															
1. Did yo	u qain ne	w insights,ski		this course	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00
		tor make clear			2	0	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	1119/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09
		ations reflect			2	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	631/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.44
				nat you learned	2	0	2	0	6	11	13	4.03	834/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03
		_		what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	15	4.31		4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.31
		system clearly		ned	2	0	0	1	6	9	16	4.25	838/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.25
	-	was class cance			2	1	0	1	3	8	19		1140/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.45
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	22	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	518/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84
		Lecture	e															
		ctor's lectures			24	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	995/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12
		tor seem intere		_	24	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.43
		-		plained clearly	24	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40		3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.87
		s contribute to			24	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	696/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.85
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance you	ur understanding	24	5	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.90
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ate to w	nat you learned	9	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.12
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.44
				open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	780/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.32
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		10	6	2	4	5	4	3	3.11	792/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.11
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understar	nding of	the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
				round information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
				r lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
		tructor provide			33	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		4.44	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtio	n									
Crodita E	arnod	Cum CDA		Exported Crades				D.O.	ason	a			Ту	20			Majors	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									ason	5 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	30
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	в 14			_			-						3 -		
56-83							neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 3	4	Non-	major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	onses to be sign			gnificant	
				I 0		Otł	ner				2	6						
				3 0														

Page 1329

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101 University of Maryland Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II Baltimore County

Instructor: GERBER, EVIE Spring 2009

Enrollment: 41 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1330

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

				eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1466/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1380/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.00

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

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Title Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J

Enrollment: 60 Questionnaires: 49 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1331 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

~								~										
								_	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne			om this course	1	0	1	0	9	22	16	4.08	1100/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.08
_	_	-		xpected goals	1	0	0	2	7	16		4.25	939/1576		4.19	4.27	4.28	4.25
				expected goals	1	0	1	7	6	18	16		1089/1342		4.17	4.32	4.30	3.85
		ations reflec			1	1	1	1	7	12	26	4.30	815/1520		4.17		4.25	4.30
				what you learned	1	1	12	3	14	14	4	2.89	1417/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.89
				to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	18	23	4.32	614/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.32
		system clear		-	2	0	3	1	5	14	24	4.17	916/1547			4.19	4.21	4.17
		was class can			1	0	0	0	0	5	43				4.67	4.64	4.61	4.90
				ching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	7	20	11		913/1554			4.10		4.03
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectur	es well	prepared	1	0	0	0	3	13	32	4.60	750/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60
		in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	18	27		1201/1493		4.67	4.73	4.70	4.51		
		explained clearly	2	0	1	3	5	18	20	4.13	1054/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.13		
		you learned	2	0	1	1	10	16	19	4.09	1075/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.09		
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques e	your understanding	4	9	2	2	9	7	16	3.92	791/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.92	
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did c	lass discu	assions contril	bute to	what you learned	21	0	3	1	2	10	12	3.96	840/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.96
				ed to participate	21	0	0	2	2	10	14	4.29	814/1270		4.33	4.35	4.42	4.29
				nd open discussion	22	0	0	2	2	8	15	4.33	773/1269		4.33	4.35	4.41	
		echniques succ			22	8	2	1	4	5	7		642/ 878		3.86		4.09	3.74
		Labora	atory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	crease underst	anding o	of the material	44	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	***
2. Were	you provid	ded with adequa	ate bacl	ground information	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	***
3. Were	necessary	materials ava	ilable i	for lab activities	45	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	***
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provi	de assis	stance	45	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	***
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab re	ports c	learly specified	45	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 27	 0	0 00 0 00	 7 14								·				 Mo≓-		16	
00-27 28-55	9	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	A 14 B 25		ке	quir	eu I	or M	ajor	Ğ.	0	Graduat	C	0	Majo	)T	46	
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	C 5		Go	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 4	19	Non-	-major	3	
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		00	c.a	_				•	onaci -g	raa -		14011		5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14 10	F 0		E1	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here :	re not	enous	rh
Jiaa.	0	3.30 1.00	10	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD				0	respons				_	,
						0+	her				Δ	10	respons	-5 CO L	5191	Cai		
			P 0 I 0								7							

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: ELDER, CHARLOTT

Enrollment: 60

Questionnaires: 12

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1332 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	\$		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1241/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	3	6		1082/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	835/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	837/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1225/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	564/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	978/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1074/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1048/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1384/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1222/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1283/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	802/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	881/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	1	3		1005/1269		4.33	4.35	4.41	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	138/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	122/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	67/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	90/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0			4.43	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.29	4.54	4.69	4.69	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	4.43	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		,		4.37	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	4.43	4.61	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	***	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: ELDER, CHARLOTT

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 12

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1332 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: OZDEMIR, SERGI

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1333 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ranl	2	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did yo	ou gain new	insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1065/15	576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.13
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	759/15	576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.40
		stions reflec			0	4	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1068/13	342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.91
		tions reflect			0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	768/15	520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.33
				what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	4	3		1059/14		3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.82
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	748/14		4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.20
		system clearl		-	0	0	1	2	6	2	4		1380/15		4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.40
		as class canc			0	0	0	1	0	3	11		1003/15		4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.60
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	3			1124/15				4.10		3.82
J. 110W W	Jaia you gi	ade the overa	II ccac	ning circultychess	-	O	Ü	O	3	5	,	3.02	1121/13	<i>J J I</i>	3.75	1.01	1.10	1.05	3.02
		Lectur	е																
1. Were t	the instruc	tor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1072/14	188	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.30
2. Did th	ne instruct	or seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1337/14	193	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.30
3. Was le	ecture mate	xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1003/14	186	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.20		
4. Did th	ne lectures	you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1065/14	189	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.10		
		our understanding	5	4	2	1	1	2	0		1238/12		3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.50		
		1																	
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	lass discus	sions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	802/12	279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were a	all student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1019/12	270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.86
3. Did th	ne instruct	or encourage	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	928/12	269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.00
		hniques succe			8	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	631/ 8	378		3.86	4.05		3.75
		Labora	_				_		_										
				f the material	9	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	201/ 2		3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.67
				ground information	9	0	0	1	2	2		3.50	226/ 2		4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.50
	_			or lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	3		4.00	203/ 2		4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.00
		ructor provid			9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	165/ 2	232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.00
5. Were 1	requirement	s for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	362/ 3	379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.50
			_																
1 Did a	alf magad a	Self		what was laawaad	1 /	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/	40	****	5.00	4.60	1 02	****
I. DIG S	ell-paced s	system contrib	ule lo	what you learned	14	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/	40	***	5.00	4.60	4.83	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utior	ı										
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	e			Majors	3	
00 27		7 C								0				0			12		
00-27							auire	ea I	or Ma	Jors	S	0	Gradı	uate	=	0	Majo	DT.	13
28-55								,				0	7			_	3-7		•
56-83							nera:	Τ				0	Under	r-gr	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	2
	1 100 1 0:00 0:19 0 0														_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	jh
				P 0									respo	onse	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.3							
				? 0															

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: THOMPSON, CAITL

Enrollment:

60 Questionnaires: 22

Page 1334 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

2410111010	0041107
Spring	2009
Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

								-	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	3	7	12	0	3.41	1482/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.41
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	4	9	5	4		1438/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.41
		estions reflect			1	6	0	2	5	5	3		1184/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.60
	_	ations reflect			0	0	1	3	5	9	4		1349/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.55
				what you learned	1	6	3	4	5	2	1		1444/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.60
				o what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	8	6		1142/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.67
		system clearly		_	1	0	2	5	5	1	8		1384/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.38
	-	was class cance	_	iiica	1	0	0	1	0	1	19		665/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.81
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	3	12	4	19		1439/1554		4.01		4.09	3.05
9. HOW WC	Julu you g	grade the overal	.i ceac	ming effectiveness	3	U	U	3	12	4	U	3.05	1439/1334	3.19	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.05
		Lecture	:															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectures	well	prepared	7	0	1	2	6	5	1	3.20	1433/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.20
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	8	0	0	3	5	4	2	3.36	1481/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	3.36
		explained clearly	8	0	3	3	6	1	1	2.57	1467/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	2.57		
		you learned	7	0	2	2	5	4	2		1403/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.13		
		our understanding	9	7	1	0	4	0	1		1149/1277		4.03	4.03		3.00		
J. Dia ad	aaiovibaai	ccciniiques em	our understanding		,	_	Ü	•	O	_	3.00	1110/12//	3.32	1.05	1.05	1.11	3.00	
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	assions contribu	ite to	what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1064/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	ourage	ed to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	892/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.13
				nd open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1036/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.75
		echniques succes			14	1	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	764/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.29
		T - 1																
1 511.1		Laborat	-	6 . 1		0	0	2		-	_	2 26	000/004	2 00	4 00	4 00	4 0 4	2 26
		crease understar			11	0	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	220/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.36
				ground information	11	0	1	1	4	1		3.55	224/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.55
				for lab activities	11	1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	203/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.00
		structor provide			11	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	152/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.18
5. Were r	requiremer	nts for lab repo	rts cl	early specified	11	1	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	325/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.90
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	onferences			ield activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			ТУ	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 A 6					or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		20	
28-55	7	B 10		Rec	4ull.	eu I	OT I√I	ajor	Ö	J	Graduat	<b>C</b>	J	ria JC	) <u> </u>	∠∪		
56-83	8	C 2		Cer	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad ?	2	Non	-major	2		
84-150	2	D 0		Gel	иста.	_				U	onder-g	rau 2	- 4	11011-	ma JUL	۷		
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49	Б 0 F 0		. המ	ecti					0	####	Moana +	horo -	.xo ~c+	ono	•h	
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	5			F.T.6	=CL1	ves				U	#### - 1				_	lTT.
				P 0							_	_	respons	es to £	e sigr	ııııcar	16	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.6						
				? 0	Other													

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R

Instructor: MII Enrollment: 50

50

Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1335 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	12	17	9		1388/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	13	11	17	4.00	1138/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	12	12	12		1157/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	11	15	14	3.93	1128/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	8	6	12	11	5	2.98	1395/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	6	17	15	3.95	941/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	6	29	4.44	624/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	26	4.60	1003/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	2	13	16	2	3.47	1317/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	7	33	4.65	680/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	6	13	24		1278/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	15	19	4.21	988/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32		4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	6	7	16	12		1251/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	4	17	17		638/1277		4.03	4.03	4.11	
Discussion														
	_	0	4	_	11	1.0	_	2 20	1125/1270	2 07	4 00	4 1 1	4 00	2 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4 2	7 5	11	10	9		1135/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	-	_	-	12	9	13		1103/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	4	10	14	10		1092/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	2	16	6	4	3	8	4	3.00	799/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	5	4	8	15	10	3.50	209/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	7	15	14	3.90	209/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	2	7	11	20	4.22	188/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	2	8	11	17	3.97	169/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	3.97
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	1	5	4	15	14	3.92	305/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	4.43	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.29	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	4.43	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		4.14	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	4.43	4.61	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	0	0		, 52	****	****	4.48	3.92	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	"""/ 40			4.40	3.92	
Self Paced	4.7	0	•	0	0	-	-	4 50	****	4.4.4.1	F 00	4 66	4 02	an an an a
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	***

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1335 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	38
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	20						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	39	_			
				?	0						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: HAHN, AMY

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1336 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1106/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	891/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	744/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1292/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	991/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	527/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1236/1574		4.67	4.64	4.61	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	518/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1118/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	649/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	763/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	754/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	70/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	69/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	54/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	60/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	58/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.64

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	0						

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: MIN, CHRIS

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1337 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1042/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	3		1023/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27		4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	1	2		1110/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	1	2		1212/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00		3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	878/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	900/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1227/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1486		4.28	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1022/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	0	2		1116/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35		3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	0	2		1086/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	709/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05		3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	219/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3 38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	148/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35		4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50		4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	,	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	229/ 379		4.33	4.20	4.17	
To a second		D	2 1		_									

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

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: SPRUNG, MOLLIE

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1338 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1445/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1023/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1097/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1292/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	878/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1239/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	924/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	636/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	464/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	117/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	109/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	93/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	115/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	55/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.67
Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ıt i o	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	Λ						

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 27

39

ALONSO, DIANE

University of Maryland Page 1339 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	429/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	515/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	418/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	429/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	571/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8		4.54		4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4		4.77	228/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	586/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	649/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.32
Taskiiia														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	2	0	1.0	1 [1	024/1400	4 20	4 20	4 47	1 17	4 54
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1 1	0	0	0	2	8	16 20	4.54	834/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47 4.73	4.47	4.54 4.77
<ol> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearly</li> </ol>	1	0	0	2	4	6 10	10		888/1493 1078/1486	4.36 3.98	4.67 4.28	4.73	4.70 4.32	4.77
	1	0	2	0	2	10	12		1078/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.15	309/1277		4.20	4.32	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	U	U	U	3	0	15	4.50	309/12//	3.34	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	860/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	7	10	4.32	798/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	814/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	764/ 878			4.05		3.29
-														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	4	3	5	6	8	3.42	216/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	7	10	9	4.08	191/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	3	1	2	3	6	11	4.04	200/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.04
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	3	3	5	15	4.23	146/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	1	2	3	5	13	4.13	200/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	71/ 85	4.43	4.71	4.72	4.67	4.43
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	64/ 79	4.29	4.54	4.69	4.69	4.29
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	55/ 72	4.43	4.71		4.53	4.43
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	69/ 80	4.14	4.37	4.61		4.14
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	U	1	0	1	5	4.43	161/ 375	4.43	4.61	4.01	4.12	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.40	****/ 44	****	****	4.40	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/ 45	****	****	4.73	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	2	0	3		****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	***
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid accivities	44	U	U	U	۷	U	ی	1.20	/ 320			4.03	1.43	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****
		_	-	-	_	_	_		, 502					

Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II

Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1339 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 333 0101 Title

LAUGHTER AND HUMOR (SS

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 67 Questionnaires: 37

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1340 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	11	9	13	3.84	1299/1576	3.84	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	12	10	3.65	1352/1576	3.65	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	9	10	3.54	1199/1342	3.54	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	12	8	6	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	10	20	4.31	596/1465	4.31	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	8	10	11	6	3.30	1303/1434	3.30	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	10	9	15	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	4.70	851/1574	4.70	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	4	14	10	6	3.46	1326/1554	3.46	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	8	12	12	3.83	1334/1488	3.83	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	8	12	10	3.82	1225/1486	3.82	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	5	9	17	4.03	1107/1489	4.03	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	2	4	11	16	3.97	725/1277	3.97	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	9	9	6	3.59	1026/1279	3.59	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	4	10	10	3.96	959/1270	3.96	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	3	14	8	4.04	921/1269	4.04	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.04
4. Were special techniques successful	10	20	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/ 878	***	3.86	4.05	4.09	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	С	8	General	7	Under-grad	36	Non-major	29
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	=			
				0	0						

Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO

Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE

Enrollment: 155
Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1341 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	1	_	_	^	0.4	4 00	004/1576	4 00	1 0 1	4 20	4 20	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	9	24	4.29	904/1576		4.24		4.30	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	Τ	3	/	12	18		1113/1576	4.05	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	Τ	0	0	3	8	12	17	4.07	948/1342	4.07	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	4	4	14	9		1225/1520	3.81	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	8	11	17	3.95			4.08	4.12	4.09	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	4	6	13	11		1172/1434	3.61	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.61
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	30	10	4.25	1324/1574	4.25	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	3	8	18	2	3.61	1260/1554	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.61
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	2	_	2.4	4 70	440/1400	4 70	4 20	4 47	4.47	4.78
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	34	4.78	442/1488		4.39	4.47		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	Τ	0	0	0	0	12	28		1017/1493	4.70	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	Ţ	0	0	2	6	13	19	4.22	981/1486	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	10	23	4.38	834/1489	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	5	16	17	4.23	551/1277	4.23	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	5	0	1	1	3	2.70	****/1279	****	4.08	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	4	1	4	0	1		****/1270	****	4.33	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	4	1	3	0	3		1241/1269	2.73	4.33	4.35	4.41	2.73
4. Were special techniques successful	30	9	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****
1. Mete apecial techniques auccessiui	30	و	_	U	U	_	U	2.50	, 576		3.00	1.03	1.09	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	19
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	С	4	General	3	Under-grad	40	Non-major	22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101
Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS

Enrollment: 59
Questionnaires: 35

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1342 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	17	9	3.91	1231/1576	3.91	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	12	9	7	3.47	1405/1576	3.47	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	12	7	10	3.67	1166/1342	3.67	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	5	8	9	8	3.58	1336/1520	3.58	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	9	11	11	3.85	1028/1465	3.85	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	13	11	6	3.63	1162/1434	3.63	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	11	13		1072/1547	3.97	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	20	12	4.29	1295/1574	4.29	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	2	7	10	1	3.38	1355/1554	3.38	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	13	13	4.27	1103/1488	4.27	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	6	22	4.63	1089/1493	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	6	12	8	3.73	1261/1486	3.73	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	6	13	8	3.83	1222/1489	3.83	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	2	6	8	10	3.79	869/1277	3.79	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	7	6	6	3.71	981/1279	3.71	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	3	3	7	6	3.70	1075/1270	3.70	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	3	2	8	7	3.81	1018/1269	3.81	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	782/ 878	3.18	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.18

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	35	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101 Title

University of Maryland PSYCH OF AGGRESSION Baltimore County

?

0

Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID

Enrollment: 65 Questionnaires: 44 Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1343 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Cou	rse	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Ме	an	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1 Did vo	nı dain ne	General w insights,skills from	this course	1	0	0	0	2	14	27	4.58	527/15	76 4	58	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.58
_	_	ctor make clear the exp		1	0	0	1	1	12	29	4.60	- , -		60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.60
		estions reflect the ex		1	0	0	0	2	14	27	4.58	500/13		58	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.58
	_	ations reflect the exp		1	0	0	1	4	16	22	4.37	719/15		37	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.37
		eadings contribute to w		1	0	0	3	1	10	29	4.51			51	4.17	4.12	4.09	4.51
	_	signments contribute to	_	1	0	1	2	8	14	18	4.07			07	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.07
		g system clearly explai		1	0	0	1	2	11	29	4.58			58	4.18	4.14	4.15	4.58
			.nea		-	0	_	_										
		was class cancelled		1 5	0	0	0	0 2	18 18	25		1018/15		58	4.67	4.64		4.58
9. HOW WO	oura you g	grade the overall teach	ling effectiveness	5	U	U	U	2	18	19	4.44	490/15	54 4.	44	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.44
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures well p	repared	2	0	1	0	0	12	29	4.62	736/148	38 4.	62	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.62
		ctor seem interested in		2	0	0	0	0	9	33	4.79	849/149		79	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.79
		erial presented and ex		2	0	0	0	4	12	26	4.52	654/148	36 4.	52	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.52
		es contribute to what y		2	0	1	0	3	6	32	4.62			62			4.34	
		techniques enhance yo		2	0	2	0	4	7	29	4.45			45	4.03	4.03		
3. 21a aa		r committees commisse 70	ar anacrocanarii	_	Ü	_	ŭ	-	•		1.15	330, 12	,		1.05	1.05		11.15
		Discussion																
		ssions contribute to w		24	0	1	1	2	5		4.20	712/12		20	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.20
		nts actively encouraged		25	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	582/12	70 4.	58	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.58
3. Did th	ne instruc	l open discussion	24	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	511/12	59 4.	70	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.70	
4. Were s	special te	chniques successful		25	2	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	378/ 8	78 4.	24	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.24
		Seminar																
1 Were a	accioned t	copics relevant to the	announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35 **	**	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
		ctor available for indi		43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	-	**	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
		cojects contribute to w		43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		**	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
	_	ons contribute to what	_	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		**	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
		for grading made clear	you rearried	43	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 3'		**	4.61	4.01	4.12	****
5. Were C	illella l	or grading made clear		43	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 3	75		4.01	4.01	4.12	
		Field Work																
		rience contribute to wh		43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52 **	**	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	v understand your evalu	ation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	18 **	**	****	4.40	3.92	****
		Colf Dogod																
1. Did se	lf-paced	Self Paced system contribute to w	hat vou learned	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	10 **	**	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
i. Dia be	zii pacca	System contribute to w	niae you rearned	13	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	1.00	,			3.00	1.00	1.03	
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	า										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Do.	ason	c			r	3mc				Majors	
CIECTICS F			Expedied Grades						o 			· 	Гуре 					, 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	`s	4	Gradua	ate		0	Majo	or	30
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	в 18															
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 7	C 0		Gei	nera:	1			1	1	Under-	-grad	4	4	Non-	major	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	- Mean	s t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
			P 0									respo	nses t	o b	e sign	ifican	nt	
			I 0		Otl	her				2	0							
			2 0															

Course-Section: PSYC 345 0101 Title

INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 32

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1344 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean		Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	21	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	572/1342	4.52	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	1	1	4	17	4.46	597/1520	4.46	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	10	15	4.34	562/1465	4.34	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	4	6	13	3.79	1069/1434	3.79	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	22	4.48	559/1547	4.48	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1574		4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	298/1554	4.63	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture	0	0	0	0	1	7	0.4	4 70	E00/1400	4 70	4 20	4 47	4 47	4 70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	589/1488		4.39	4.47	4.47	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	7		4.66	484/1486		4.28	4.32	4.32	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0 2	0 5	0 2	0 2	1 7	6	25	4.75	378/1489		4.26	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	2	/	4	10	3.72	909/1277	3.72	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	19	11	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** OF	****	4 71	4 70	4 60	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	•	0	1		****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0 0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31 31	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	4.00	****/ 72 ****/ 80	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 375	****	4.37 4.61	4.61 4.01	4.22 4.12	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	/ 3/5		4.01	4.01	4.12	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
• • •														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****

Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: 53
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1344 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI

Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD

Enrollment: 81
Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1345 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	3	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Cours Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1 5'1		General		2	0	_	-	1	_	0	2 00	1501/155		4 0 4	4 20	4 20	2 00
-	_	J ,	lls from this course	3	0	6	1		6	9		1501/1576		4.24		4.30	3.28
			the expected goals	3	0	3 4	6	13 12	17	0		1511/1576			4.27	4.28	3.13
	_		the expected goals	3	0 27	2	10 3	5	8 2	5 0		1294/1342			4.32	4.30	3.00 2.58
			the expected goals	3	1	7	11	9	8	3		1507/1520			4.25	4.25	2.58
	-	-	ite to what you learned	3		1				-		1435/146					∠./⊥ ****
		-	bute to what you learned	4	33	4	1 2	2	0	1		****/1434			4.14	4.15	
	-	g system clearly	_	4		0		8	8 9			1227/154			4.19	4.21	3.79
	-	was class cance		4 7	1	υ 5	2	17	-	9		1545/157			4.64	4.61	3.68
9. HOW WO	oura you	grade the overa.	ll teaching effectiveness	/	Τ	5	6	13	8	2	2.88	1488/155	1 3.39	4.01	4.10	4.09	2.88
		Lecture	2														
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	5	0	0	1	7	6	23	4.38	1018/1488	3 4.37	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.38
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested in the subject	5	0	1	0	2	9	25	4.54	1176/1493	3 4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.54
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and explained clearly	5	0	3	6	10	9	9	3.41	1362/1486	3.76	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.41
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what you learned	5	0	1	4	8	11	13	3.84	1222/1489	3.94	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.84
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance your understanding	5	7	4	5	7	2	12	3.43	1052/127	7 3.73	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.43
		Discuss	ui on														
1 Did al	ace diec		ite to what you learned	13	0	9	9	5	3	3	2 38	1263/1279	3.09	4.08	4.17	4.20	2.38
			couraged to participate	13	0	12	3	8	3	3		1254/127			4.35	4.42	2.38
			Tair and open discussion	13	0	11	2	8	7	1		1248/1269			4.35	4.42	2.48
		echniques succes		14	27	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 878			4.05		****
1. Were b	pecial c	comingues succes	55141		2,	Ü	J	J	_	Ü	1.00	, 0,,	3.33	3.00	1.05	1.05	
		Laborat	cory														
_	_	_	te background information		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 240		4.19	4.35	4.32	****
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clearly specified	39	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****
		Semina	_														
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute t	to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
		n:-14 r	71-														
3 Was th	a instru	Field W	vork For consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 4	1 ****	****	4 73	4.63	****
3. Was til	ie ilistiu	ctor available i	of Consultation	41	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 4.	<b>.</b>		4.73	4.03	
		Self I															
	_	-	ite to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	, -	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the in	nstructor helpful	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 3!	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
			Freq	uency	, Dis	strib	outio	n									
a 1'. =	. 1	g gp.					_					_					
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				R€	eason	s 			T <u>y</u>	/pe 			Majors	; . – – – –
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 1		Re	equir	red f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	27
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0 B 17														
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6 C 10		Ge	enera	al				1	Under-	grad	42	Non-	-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5 D 5														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -		there a		_	ıh

Other

30

Ρ

I

?

1

0

1

Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI

Instructor: RUDOW, EDWARD H

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 30

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1346 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				equer		s			tructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	8	10	8	3.73	1353/1576	3.51	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	10	13	4.13	1049/1576	3.63	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	10	11	3.90	1068/1342	3.45	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	4	4	5		1008/1520	3.33	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	5	8	12	4.15	748/1465	3.43	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	23	0	0	1	1	1		****/1434	****	4.09	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	- , -	4.16	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.82			4.67	4.64	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	4	9	5	3.89	1067/1554	3.39	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	1033/1488	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	11	15		1278/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	12	10	4.11	1069/1486	3.76	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	9	13	4.03	1102/1489	3.94	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	5	7	14	4.03	680/1277	3.73	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	7	۵	10	3.80	938/1279	3.09	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	, 8	10	11	4.03	920/1270	3.21	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	702/1269	3.46	4.33	4.35	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	18	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	700/ 878			4.05		3.55
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
mi al di massis														
Field Work	0.0	0	1	0	^	^	0	1 00	**** / FO			4 40	4 27	****
Did field experience contribute to what you learned     Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29 29	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52 ****/ 48	****	****	4.48	3.92	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	U	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	^^^/ 48	***	^ ^ ^ ^	4.40	3.92	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	1						

Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

Enrollment:

136 Questionnaires: 84

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1347 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	5	10	23	43	4.28	916/1576		4.24	4.30	4.30	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	5	15	30	27	3.88	1253/1576	3.62	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	10	7	30	30	3.92	1048/1342	3.70	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	7	7	12	28	20	3.64	1315/1520	3.65	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	5	22	21	31	3.95	919/1465	3.95	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	10	17	16	24	12	3.14	1349/1434	3.12	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	2	7	19	49	4.41	690/1547	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	12	67	4.85	586/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	7	17	35	17	3.74	1173/1554	3.29	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	4	10	23	40	4.12	1192/1488	3.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	4	7	67	4.74	947/1493	4.53	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	8	9	17	23	23	3.55	1318/1486	3.30	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	9	10	14	45		1070/1489	3.52	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	8	7	23	39		608/1277		4.03	4.03	4.11	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	5	Ω	6	11	19	3 63	1011/1279	3.29	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	2	5	7	10	25	4.04	918/1270	3.81	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	2	6	5	16	18	3.89	994/1269	3.98	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	37	37	3	1	0	3	3		****/ 878	3.08	3.86	4.05	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	51	J		U	J	,	3.20	7 070	3.00	3.00	1.03	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	82	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 234	***	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	82	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	***	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	83	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40		****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****		4.83		****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	83 82	1	0	0	1	U T	0	4.00			4.67		4.89	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	82	Т	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	****/ 382	^^^*	5.00	4.08	4.24	^ ^ ^ ^

Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI

Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 136
Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1347 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	Α	28	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	62
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	10	C	11	General	4	Under-grad	84	Non-major	22
84-150	26	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	65	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 370 8620 Title

University of Maryland SENSATION AND PERCEPTI Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: KAUTZ, MARY

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1348 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions		MD	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	5	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect
Questions		NK	NA				4		Mean	Rank	mean	mean	Mean	mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cours	se	9	0	2	3	6	6	2	3.16	1518/1576	3.72	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		9	0	1	3	6	6	3		1452/1576	3.62	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goal		9	0	2	2	5	5	5		1221/1342	3.70	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		9	1	1	1	4	9	3		1300/1520	3.65	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you lea		9	0	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	933/1465	3.95	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you l	learned	9	0	3	2	7	4	3	3.11	1360/1434	3.12	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		9	0	1	2	1	3	12	4.21	882/1547	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled		9	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	702/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effecti	iveness	14	1	1	4	4	4	0	2.85	1494/1554	3.29	4.01	4.10	4.09	2.85
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		10	0	2	6	4	5	1	2.83	1465/1488	3.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	ct	9	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	1331/1493	4.53	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained cle	early	11	0	2	5	2	6	2	3.06	1417/1486	3.30	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		10	0	2	5	6	2	3	2.94	1430/1489	3.52	4.26	4.32	4.34	2.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understa	anding	10	0	3	2	1	5	7	3.61	968/1277	3.89	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.61
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you lea		11	0	1	4	7	5	0		1204/1279		4.08	4.17	4.20	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to partici		11	0	0	4	3	6	4		1119/1270	3.81	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discu	ussion	11	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	917/1269	3.98	4.33	4.35	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful		10	5	3	0	4	5	1	3.08	795/ 878	3.08	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.08
	Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	tior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A	 6		Rec	uire	d fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	10
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B	6						-						_		
56-83 5 2.00-2.99 1 C	0		Ger	neral					2	Under-g	rad 2	8	Non-	major	18
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D	0									_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F	0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
Р	0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I	0		Oth	ner				1	1						
?	0														

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102 University of Maryland PERSONALITY Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 61

Title

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1349

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 3 10 47 4.69 387/1576 4.42 4.24 4.30 4.30 4.69 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 11 14 34 4.35 825/1576 4.22 4.19 4.27 4.28 4.35 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 3 11 14 33 4.26 827/1342 4.11 4.17 4.32 4.30 4.26 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 12 3 7 8 9 22 3.82 1225/1520 4.03 4.17 4.25 4.25 3.82 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 3 3 7 19 27 4.08 808/1465 4.04 4.08 4.12 4.09 4.08 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 5 2 15 12 23 3.81 1063/1434 3.81 4.09 4.14 4.15 3.81 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 3 10 13 33 4.23 860/1547 4.35 4.18 4.19 4.21 4.23 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 5 55 4.92 422/1574 4.96 4.67 4.64 4.61 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 6 20 35 4.48 436/1554 4.28 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.48 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 2 4 17 37 4.48 895/1488 4.48 4.39 4.47 4.47 4.48 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 2 57 4.93 390/1493 4.90 4.67 4.73 4.70 4.93 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 0 5 14 40 4.53 642/1486 4.43 4.28 4.32 4.32 4.53 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 1 3 9 46 4.63 539/1489 4.46 4.26 4.32 4.34 4.63 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 14 2 6 10 12 16 3.74 902/1277 4.05 4.03 4.03 4.11 3.74 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 32 0 5 4 18 4.31 617/1279 4.16 4.08 4.17 4.20 4.31 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 32 0 0 7 22 4.76 412/1270 4.62 4.33 4.35 4.42 4.76 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 32 0 0 0 1 2 26 4.86 321/1269 4.84 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.86 4. Were special techniques successful 33 19 1 2 2 3.11 \*\*\*\*/ 878 3.83 3.86 4.05 4.09 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 234 \*\*\*\* 4.03 4.23 4.24 \*\*\*\* 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 240 \*\*\*\* 4.19 4.35 4.32 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 60 0 Ω Ω Ω 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 229 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.51 4.48 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 60 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 60 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 232 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.29 4.16 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 60 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 379 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.20 4.17 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 4.71 4.72 4.67 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 60 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* 4.54 4.69 4.69 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 60 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 72 \*\*\*\* 4.71 4.64 4.53 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 60 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* 4.37 4.61 4.22 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 60 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 375 \*\*\*\* 4.61 4.01 4.12 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.48 4.37 \*\*\*\* 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 60 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.40 3.92 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 60 0 0 0 60 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 44 \*\*\*\* 4.73 4.63 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 60 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 45 \*\*\* \*\*\* 4.57 4.50 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 60 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 326 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.03 4.23 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 60 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 40 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.60 4.83 \*\*\*\* 60 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 \*\*\*\* 4.67 4.83 4.89 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 60 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 35 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.67 5.00 \*\*\*\* 60 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 28 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.78 5.00 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 382 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.08 4.24 \*\*\*\*

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102
Title PERSONALITY
Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

64

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1349 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	52
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	8	С	7	General	20	Under-grad	61	Non-major	9
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 8620 University of Maryland PERSONALITY Baltimore County Instructor: RUDOW, EDWARD H

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 22

3.50-4.00

8

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Title

Grad.

1

Page 1350 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque: 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	1058/1576	4.42	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	11		1082/1576		4.19	4.27	4.28	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	1020/1342	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	859/1520	4.03	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	11	6	4.00	850/1465	4.04	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/1434	3.81	4.09	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	575/1547		4.18	4.19	4.21	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574		4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	886/1554	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	907/1488	4.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	683/1493	4.90	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	8	11	4.33	891/1486	4.43	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	934/1489		4.26	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	446/1277	4.05	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	12	6	4.00	802/1279	4.16	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48			4.33	4.35	4.42	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	386/1269	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	1	15	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.83
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	***
Seminar	1.0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 85	++++	1 71	4 70	1 67	++++
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19 19	2 2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85 ****/ 80	****	4.71 4.37	4.72 4.61	$4.67 \\ 4.22$	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 375		4.61		4.12	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	2	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 3/3		4.01	4.01	4.12	
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35		****	4.67	5.00	****
Post of		- D-1	1											
Freq	uency	DIS	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	 aior		4	 Graduat	 e	1	Majo	r	 7
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 11								•	aaaac	-	-	ت ر سد ۔		•
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	15
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0									_				-	
- 1								^	0.00.00		1			1

Electives

Other

0

9

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1351 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	324/1576	4.74	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	713/1576	4.43	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	1	1	3	15	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	17	4.48	410/1465	4.48	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	55/1434	4.96	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	355/1554	4.56	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.56
• 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	0	18	4.64	708/1488	4.64	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	404/1277	4.41	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	189/1279	4.86	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	214/ 878	4.53	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.53
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****
_		<u> </u>	.,											
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0101 University of Maryland Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County

ANDERSON, ROBER

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1352

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 39
Questionnaires: 34
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	266/1576	4.78	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.78
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	194/1576	4.84	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.84
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	263/1342	4.78	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.78
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	2	1	0	1	8	20	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.53
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	10	17	4.32	579/1465	4.32	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.32
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	10	19	4.47	448/1434	4.47	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.47
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	0	0	0	3	3	26	4.72	280/1547	4.72	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.72
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	21	11	4.34	1253/1574	4.34	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.34
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	222/1554	4.72	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.72
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	385/1488	4.81	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.81
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested i	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	201/1486	4.88	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.88
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	136/1489	4.94	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	our understanding	4	3	3	1	6	4	13	3.85	829/1277	3.85	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.85
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	312/1279	4.70	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.70
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.90
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful	-	24	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****
		Labora	atory															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	anding o	of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	ate back	ground information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provid	le assis	stance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27 28-55	0 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 16 B 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	13
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera:	L				7	Under-g	rad 3	4	Non-	major	21
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	10	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1 respons				_	ſh
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.5	respons		c argii	ıııcaı		

? 0

Course-Section: PSYC 385H 0101
Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER

2

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1353 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Ouestic	onnair	۹^

	Frequencies				Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.03	4.03	4.11	5.00

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

Course-Section: PSYC 390 0101 Title

NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG

Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 33 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1354 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA		equei 2	ncie 3		5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u dain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	23	4.61	500/1576	4.34	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.61
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	7	6	20	4.39	772/1576	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.39
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	6	10	15	4.15	,	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.15
		uations reflect			1	26	0	0	2	1	3		****/1520	4.08	4.17	4.25	4.25	****
				hat you learned	0	6	0	1	7	9	10	4.04	834/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.04
				what you learned	0	28	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1434	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.15	****
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	375/1547	4.28	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.64
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	7	16	10	4.09	1427/1574	4.51	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.09
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	8	0	0	0	8	13	4	3.84	1103/1554	3.71	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84
		Lectur	e															
l. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well p	repared	1	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	680/1488	4.64	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.66
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	908/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.76
		olained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	5	19	4.21	988/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.21		
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	4	6	22	4.48	719/1489	4.51	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.48
				ur understanding	1	1	1	3	4	7	16	4.10	656/1277	4.39	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.10
		Discus	sion															
l. Did cla	hat you learned	18	0	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	1186/1279	3.30	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.00			
				to participate	18	0	0	3	3	4	5		1062/1270	3.32	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.73
				open discussion	18	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	915/1269	3.63	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.07
		echniques succe		•	18	12	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 878		3.86	4.05	4.09	****
		Labora	torv															
l. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	-	the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
		Semina	r															
l. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	4.71	4.72	4.67	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	ason	g			Ту	ne			Majors	ŧ
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	`S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12		~		,			-	0	77 J			37		0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C 7		Gei	nera:	L			1	2	Under-g	rad 3	33	Non-	-major	9
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		EΙθ	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### -				_	n
				P 0		0.1					-	responses to be significant		1T				
				I 0		Oti	ner				1	6						
				? 2														

NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG

Title Instructor: LYNCH, MINDA R

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13 Spring 2009

Page 1355 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	1106/1576	4.34	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1094/1576	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	948/1342	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1008/1520	4.08	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	529/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	7	4	3.92	1124/1547	4.28	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.51	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1274/1554	3.71	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.58
T a mboose														
Lecture	^	0	0	^	1	2	_	1 60	726/1400	1 (1	4 20	4 47	4 47	1 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Ţ	3	12	4.62	736/1488	4.64	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	973/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32		4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	Ţ	10 10	4.54	660/1489	4.51	4.26	4.32		4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	U	U	U	Τ	2	10	4.69	194/1277	4.39	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1022/1279	3.30	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1231/1270	3.32	4.33	4.35	4.42	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1188/1269	3.63	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	770/ 878	3.25	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****
_		<u> </u>	.,											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-	_		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PSYC 393B 0101 University of Maryland PARENTING Baltimore County

Title Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER, Spring 2009

Enrollment: 30 Ouestionnaires: 30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1356

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 25 4.89 171/1576 4.89 4.24 4.30 4.30 4.89 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 0 0 3 25 4.89 171/1576 4.89 4.24 4.30 4.30 4.89 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 2 25 4.93 121/1576 4.93 4.19 4.27 4.28 4.93 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 0 0 3 25 4.89 185/1342 4.89 4.17 4.32 4.30 4.89 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 4 23 4.85 167/1520 4.85 4.17 4.25 4.25 4.85 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 1 5 2 19 4.32 579/1465 4.32 4.08 4.12 4.09 4.32 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 0 3 25 4.89 129/1547 4.89 4.18 4.19 4.21 4.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 2 26 4.93 375/1574 4.93 4.67 4.64 4.61 4.93 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 0 2 20 4.91 116/1554 4.91 4.01 4.10 4.09 4.91 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 Ω 0 0 1 25 4.96 99/1488 4.96 4.39 4.47 4.47 4.96 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 0 26 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.67 4.73 4.70 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 0 26 5.00 1/1486 5.00 4.28 4.32 4.32 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1/1489 5.00 4.26 4.32 4.34 5.00 4 0 0 0 0 0 26 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0 0 0 2 23 4.92 84/1277 4.92 4.03 4.03 4.11 4.92 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 3 0 12 4.60 381/1279 4.60 4.08 4.17 4.20 4.60 15 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 1 2 12 4.73 435/1270 4.73 4.33 4.35 4.42 4.73 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 535/1269 4.67 4.33 4.35 4.41 4.67 4. Were special techniques successful 15 0 1 0 2 12 4.67 164/878 4.67 3.86 4.05 4.09 4.67 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 29 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 234 \*\*\*\* 4.03 4.23 4.24 \*\*\*\* 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 240 \*\*\*\* 4.19 4.35 4.32 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 29 0 Ω Ω Ω 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 229 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.51 4.48 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 29 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* / 232 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.29 4.16 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 379 \*\*\*\* 4.33 4.20 4.17 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 4.71 4.72 4.67 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 29 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* 4.54 4.69 4.69 \*\*\*\* 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 72 \*\*\*\* 4.71 4.64 4.53 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 80 \*\*\*\* 4.37 4.61 4.22 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 375 \*\*\*\* 4.61 4.01 4.12 \*\*\*\* Field Work 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 52 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.48 4.37 \*\*\*\* 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 29 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 48 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.40 3.92 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 29 0 0 Ω 29 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 44 \*\*\*\* 4.73 4.63 \*\*\*\* 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 45 \*\*\*\* 4.57 4.50 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 326 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.03 4.23 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 29 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 40 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.60 4.83 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 29 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 \*\*\*\* 4.67 4.83 4.89 \*\*\*\* 0 0 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
 Were there enough proctors for all the students 29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 35 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.67 5.00 \*\*\*\*

29 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 28 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.78 5.00 \*\*\*\*

0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 382 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.08 4.24 \*\*\*\*

Title PARENTING

Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
Enrollment: 30

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 30

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1356 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 393F 8620 Title

PERSPECTIVES: FORENSIC

Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1357 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies				5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1112/1576	4.06	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	879/1342	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	719/1520	4.38	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	955/1547	4.13	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1184/1493	4.53	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	951/1486	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	1042/1489	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	229/1277	4.64	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1279	4.22	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	997/1269	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00

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

Course-Section: PSYC 406 8620 University of Maryland Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: MARTINEZ, MARIA

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1358 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	1	13	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	798/1576	4.38	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	788/1342	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	631/1520	4.44	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	0	10	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	999/1547	4.07	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	795/1574	4.73	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	886/1554	4.08	4.01	4.10	4.24	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	658/1493	4.87	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	664/1277	4.08	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.70	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	511/1269	4.70	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reason				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	 7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 407 0101 University of Maryl Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: SONNENSCHEIN, S Spring 2009

I 0

?

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

24

University of Maryland Page 1359
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

16

	Evaluation	

						Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	5	7	6	4.06	1118/1576	4.06	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.06
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						1	2	5	7	3	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.19	4.27	4.35	3.50
3. Did th	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	1	3	9	5	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	2	1	12	3	3.89	1179/1520	3.89	4.17	4.25	4.38	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	1	2	6	3	6	3.61	1167/1434	3.61	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	1	2	5	8	2	3.44	1366/1547	3.44	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					4	0	2	0	5	6	1	3.29	1381/1554	3.29	4.01	4.10	4.24	3.29
		Lectu	re															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1197/1488	4.12	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	1142/1493	4.59	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	2	1	9	5	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1057/1489	4.12	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	1	7	4	3	3.44	1052/1277	3.44	4.03	4.03	4.04	3.44
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.08	4.17	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	908/1270	4.08	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful						2	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	660/ 878	3.70	3.86	4.05	4.33	3.70
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ation	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Reasons						Type			Majors		•
	Expected Grades																na jora	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Required for Majors				s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	18	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7							_		_	_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 6		General				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	0		
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	11	D 0														
Grad.	0	0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 P 0					Electives					0	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>					

Other

Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101 University of Maryland
Title DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT Baltimore County

DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT Baltimore County
BAKER, LINDA Spring 2009

Instructor: BAKER, LII

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1360

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei		s			ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	2	10	3.95	1187/1576	3.95	4.19	4.27	4.35	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1342	****	4.17	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	12	4.19	921/1520	4.19	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	175/1465	4.81	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	5	3	4	2.90	1485/1547	2.90	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	11	2	3.78	1152/1554	3.78	4.01	4.10	4.24	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	1142/1488	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	683/1493	4.85	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	1149/1486	3.95	4.28	4.32	4.41	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	6	5		1381/1489	3.25	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	672/1277	4.05	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.73	182/1270	4.75	4.33	4.17	4.53	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	1	2	2	13	4.10	446/ 878	4.10	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	U	T	2	۷	5	4.10	440/ 0/0	4.10	3.00	4.05	4.33	4.10
Frem	ency	Dist	rih	ıt i oı	า									

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 446 0101

Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Instructor: FOX, MARY H

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 7

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1361 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	2 00	1325/1576	2 00	1 01	4 20	1 10	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	2		,	3.80 4.40	4.24	4.30 4.27	4.46 4.35	3.80 4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1576 480/1342		4.19 4.17			
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	683/1520	4.60 4.40	4.17	4.32	4.46 4.38	4.60 4.40
	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.40	647/1465	4.40	4.17	4.12	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	∠ 1		878/1434		4.08	4.12		4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	∠ 3	0	1	0	1	3	1	4.00	, -	4.00			4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0 T	0	0	Ţ	Τ		1413/1547	3.25	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	5.00	1003/1574	4.60	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U	U	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.01	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	0	1	0		1238/1277	2.50	4.03	4.03	4.04	
5. Dia addio.ibddi ocomiiqaeb emianoc year anderboanding	-	_	_	Ü	Ü	-	ŭ	2.50	1200,12.,	2.50	1.05	1.05	1.01	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.19	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.90	****

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101 University of Mary Title FAMILY PSYCHOLOGY Baltimore Count Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

23

University of Maryland Page 1362
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions						Fro	equer 2	ncie 3	s 1	_		tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC		
		Question	s 		NK	NA				-4 	5	Mean	Rank	mean	mean	mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	609/1576	4.53	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.53
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	6		4.24	958/1576	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.24
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	227/1342	4.82	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.82
		uations reflect			0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	815/1520	4.29	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.29
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41		4.41	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.41
				o what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	636/1434	4.29	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.29
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	794/1547	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.29
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1189/1574	4.41	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.41
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	347/1554	4.56	4.01	4.10	4.24	4.56
		<u>.</u> .																
1 1/1 +-	.b	Lectur uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	2	4	1.0	4.41	982/1488	4.41	4 20	4.47	4.55	1 11
		prepared n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10 16	4.41	334/1493	4.41	4.39 4.67	4.47	4.55	4.41		
		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	Τ.	11	4.59	584/1486	4.59	4.07	4.73	4.41			
			0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	448/1489	4.71	4.26	4.32		4.71		
	oid the lectures contribute to what you learned oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	0	1	3	12	4.71	201/1277		4.20	4.03		4.69
5. Did au	la IOVISUA.	ı techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	1	U	U	1	3	12	4.69	201/12//	4.09	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.69
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	582/1279	4.36	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.36
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	447/1270	4.73	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.73
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	559/1269	4.64	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.64
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	355/ 878	4.27	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.27
				Frequ	onar	. Dia	t wib	1+101	2									
				rrequ	lency	DIS	CLID	10101	.1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	5	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8							ed fo	or M	 ajor	s	1	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8						-						_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.4			_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 493B 0101 University of Maryland Title PARTNERSHIP: US/AFGHANS Baltimore County

Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE Enrollment: 8

Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1576 5.00 4.24 4.30 4.46 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 187/1576 4.86 4.19 4.27 4.35 4.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 2 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1342 5.00 4.17 4.32 4.46 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.17 4.25 4.38 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1465 5.00 4.08 4.12 4.22 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 7 \quad 5.00$ 1/1434 5.00 4.09 4.14 4.30 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 154/1547 4.86 4.18 4.19 4.24 4.86 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 567/1574 4.86 4.67 4.64 4.69 4.86 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 263/1554 4.67 4.01 4.10 4.24 4.67

Spring 2009

Page 1363 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.86
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.41	5.00
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	5.00
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1277	4.86	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.86

#### Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.08	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.33	5.00

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493C 0101

Title CONTROVERSIES IN PSYC

Instructor: RESTA, PETER

Enrollment:

25 Ouestionnaires: 19

# Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1364 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 0 1 2 14 4.76 289/1576 4.76 4.24 4.30 4.46 4.76 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 0 1 2 14 4.76 289/1576 4.76 4.24 4.30 4.46 4.76 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 2 1 4 10 4.29 900/1576 4.29 4.19 4.27 4.35 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 8 0 1 2 0 6 4.22 857/1342 4.22 4.17 4.32 4.46 4.22 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 0 3 5 9 4.35 744/1520 4.35 4.17 4.25 4.38 4.35 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 9 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 366/1465 4.50 4.08 4.12 4.22 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 2 6 9 4.41 673/1547 4.41 4.18 4.19 4.24 4.41 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 328/1574 4.94 4.67 4.64 4.69 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 0 0 4 7 4.64 289/1554 4.64 4.01 4.10 4.24 4.64 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 3 2 9 4.43 970/1488 4.43 4.39 4.47 4.55 4.43 5 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 683/1493 4.86 4.67 4.73 4.80 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 642/1486 4.54 4.28 4.32 4.41 4.54 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 2 2 10 4.57 614/1489 4.57 4.26 4.32 4.38 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 2 0 2 0 2 8 4.33 463/1277 4.33 4.03 4.03 4.04 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 296/1279 4.71 4.08 4.17 4.31 4.71 12 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 458/1270 4.71 4.33 4.35 4.53 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 00 1 0 6 4.71 491/1269 4.71 4.33 4.35 4.55 4.71 4. Were special techniques successful 12 1 0 0 2 0 4 4.33 322/ 878 4.33 3.86 4.05 4.33 4.33 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 4.71 4.72 4.77 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 79 \*\*\*\* 4.54 4.69 4.69 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 72 \*\*\*\* 4.71 4.64 4.64 \*\*\*\* 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\* | 80 \*\*\*\* 4.37 4.61 4.52 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 375 \*\*\*\* 4.61 4.01 3.90 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Page 1365
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 493L 8620

11

LEADERSHIP

ROSEN, THEODORE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General				_	_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	415/1576		4.24	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2 1	0	1	1	1 1	5 6	4.43	683/1342 376/1520	4.43	4.17 4.17	4.32 4.25	4.46 4.38	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.63	264/1465	4.63	4.17	4.25	4.22	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	473/1434		4.09	4.14	4.30	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2		4.44	624/1547		4.18	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574		4.67	4.64	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1554			4.10		4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.14
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.45	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.70	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	***	4.33	4.20	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	****	4.03	3.97	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****

Course-Section: PSYC 493L 8620
Title LEADERSHIP

LEADERSHIP BAIROSEN, THEODORE

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1365 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101 INTERVIEWING GLYSHAW, KATHER

Instructor: Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 9

Title

JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1366

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	988/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.17	4.32	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1088/1465	3.78	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1320/1434	3.22	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1166/1554	3.75	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1388/1488	3.50	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	1		1101/1486		4.28	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	2		1255/1489		4.26	4.32	4.38	3.75

#### Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 4.11 764/1279 4.11 4.08 4.17 4.34 4.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 279/1270 4.89 4.33 4.35 4.53 4.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 421/1269 4.78 4.33 4.35 4.55 4.78 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 4 4.44 258/ 878 4.44 3.86 4.05 4.11 4.44 Self Paced

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 382 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.08 4.13 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
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	1
				P	7			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-	-		
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: PSYC 601B 0101 University of Maryland Page 1367
Title CORE II Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 8

Ctudont	Courac	Erro.	luntion	Questionr	nniro
Student	Course	r.va.	Lua L. Lon	Quest. Loni	laire

Questionnaires: 8

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean		
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.75
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1360/1576	3.63	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.63
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1191/1342	3.57	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.57
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1408/1520	3.38	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.38
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.25
				o what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.13	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.13
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	1516/1547	2.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.88
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1253/1554	3.63	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.63
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1324/1488	3.88	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.88
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	2	_		1210/1493		4.67	4.73	4.80	4.50
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5			1101/1486		4.28	4.32	4.37	4.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	2	3			1255/1489		4.26	4.32	4.38	3.75
				our understanding	0	4	0	1	0	2			889/1277		4.03	4.03		3.75
			1															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	910/1279	3.88	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.88
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	814/1270	4.29	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.29
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.33	4.35	4.55	3.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.60	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.60
				Frequ	encs	n Dist	tribı	ıtior	n									
				11040	.01107	210	01120	.0101	-									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	 e	7	Majo	r •	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:					0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					8	_					
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 601C 0101 Page 1368 Title CORE II JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 8

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ougetion	naira
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestroii	lialle

Questionnaires: 8

		Ouestion	g		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1401/1576	3.63	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.63
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.50
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1191/1342	3.57	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.57
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1438/1520	3.25	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.25
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.13	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.13
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	3	0	2	3	0	2.63	1509/1547	2.63	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.63
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.88
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1390/1554	3.25	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well :	prepared	0	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.75
		ctor seem inter	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.50
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1253/1486	3.75	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.75
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	ou learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1352/1489	3.38	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.38
5. Did au	diovisua	our understanding	0	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	889/1277	3.75	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.75		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	910/1279	3.88	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.88
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.25
				d open discussion	0	0	1	2	1	1	3		1151/1269	3.38	4.33	4.35	4.55	3.38
		echniques succe			0	2	1	0	2	2	1		755/ 878		3.86	4.05		3.33
				Frequ		. Dia	+ m i bı	.+ : 0	<b>.</b>									
				rrequ	terrey	DIS	CLID	1010.	11									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	7	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					7						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101 University of Maryland
Title LONGITUDINAL DATA ANAL Baltimore County
Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C Spring 2009

Ι

?

0

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

University of Maryland Page 1369
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

0

responses to be significant

	Ouestionnaire	

						_					<b>-</b> .		~			- 1	a .	
		Ouestions	3		NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	Mean	Level	Sect Mean
		General	=															
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.71
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.25	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1465	4.43	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.43
		-		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	167/1547	4.83	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.83
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.67
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.71
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.86
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.71
				your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	404/1277	4.40	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.40
		_																
		Discuss																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.86
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.86
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	sful		0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.67
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	1									
Credits I		Com CDA		True and ad and an				Das					m				M = = = = = =	_
credits i	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons 								Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Major						3	1	Graduat	е	3	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1	-													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							5	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ιh

Other

University of Maryland Page 1370
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 8620

14

HUMAN FACTORS

DEVRIES, ESTHER

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

		Ouestions	_		NID	3.7.7	Fr	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Questions 	5 		NK.	NA						Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	l															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.80
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.80
3. Did th	ie exam qi	uestions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.17	4.32	4.38	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1520	4.90	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.90
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.30
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	110/1434	4.90	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.90
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y explai:	ned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.90
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.67
		Lecture	<b>e</b>															
		uctor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
		terial presented			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.37	5.00
		ou learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	5.00		
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ur understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.03	4.03	4.08	5.00	
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu		-	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.78
		nts actively end			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.89
				open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.67
		Seminar																
	_	topics relevant			8	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.79	****
				vidual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****
		rojects contribu			8	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.70	***
		ons contribute t		you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.70	***
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.10	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
 00-27							าแรก	ed f	or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 _	4	Majo		 9
28-55							44TT	ca I	) I 1·10	. , טר.	_	_	Gradat	_	-	1.100 )		,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		GEI	иста	_				J	onder -g	Luu	J	INOII	a JUI	_
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		בות	ecti <sup>.</sup>	7760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
orau.	7	3.30-4.00	J			11.1		v CB				U	respons					111
	P 0											_	respons	co LU L	e sigi	irrredi	10	

Other

0

0

I

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 8620 University of Maryland Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT

? 0

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1371

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	LASSON,	ELLIOT		S	Spring 2009	
Enrollment:	13					
Questionnaires:	13		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1106/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.08
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	891/1576	4.31	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.31
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	1128/1342	3.77	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.77
4. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1520	4.31	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.31
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	748/1465	4.15	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.15
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	314/1434	4.62	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.62
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.54
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.11	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.11
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.58
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.67
			3	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42		4.42	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.42	
	s lecture material presented and explained clear d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.25
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	660/1277	4.08	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.08
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2		4.36	763/1270	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.36
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	7		620/1269	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.55
		echniques succe			2	4	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	764/ 878	3.29	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.29
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
a 1'. =	,	a ana						_					_					
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons								Ту:	pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	3	Majo	r	2
28-55																		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					8						

Course-Section: PSYC 601I 8620 University of Maryland Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL PSYC Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1372

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

GRIFFITH, KEVIN

Instructor:

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	3		1311/1576	3.75	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	977/1520	4.13	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	2		1294/1547	3.63	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1194/1554	3.71	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1018/1488	4.38	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	273/1277	4.57	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.57
Discussion				•	_	_	_		0.65 /4.050		4 00			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	365/1279	4.63	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.11	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601K 0101 Title INTRODUCTION TO BMED Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR

Enrollment:

Grad.

11

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

0

7

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Page 1373

(	Ouestionnaires:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	c c		Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	920/1576		4.19	4.27	4.32	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342		4.17	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	597/1520	4.45	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	626/1465	4.27	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	625/1434	4.30	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	4		1041/1547	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1427/1574		4.67	4.64	4.75	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	871/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	5		1069/1486	4.10	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	4		1065/1489	4.10	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	0	1	1		****/1277	***	4.03	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1279	4.22	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	694/1269	4.44	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	***	4.61	4.01	4.10	***
Fred	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
	-													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	S			Rea	ason	.s			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	11
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														

Electives

Other

University of Maryland ISSUES IN I/O PSYCHOLO Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 601L 8620 Title JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: LASSON, ELLIOT Job IRBR3029

Page 1374

Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	a		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		
			.s 		1417													
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain r	new insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.00
2. Did	the instru	actor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1495/1576	3.20	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.20
3. Did	the exam o	questions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1333/1342	2.60	4.17	4.32	4.38	2.60
4. Did	other eval	luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1400/1520	3.40	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.40
5. Did	assigned 1	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.20
6. Did	written as	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.20
7. Was	the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1380/1547	3.40	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.40
8. How	many times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Wer	e the instr	ructor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.75
2. Did	the instru	actor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1376/1493	4.20	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.20
3. Was	lecture ma	aterial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1233/1486	3.80	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.80
4. Did	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	1	2	2	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.20
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	974/1277	3.60	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.50
2. Wer	e all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.33	4.35	4.53	3.75
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.25
4. Wer	e special t	echniques succe	ssful	_	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.11	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		 Red	anir	 ed fo	 or Ma	 ajors		1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55								- L	J_ 11C	- 1010		-	GEGGGGC	~	-	11000	-	J
56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	5
84-15		3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001	c. u	-				J	onder 9		_	1,011		3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	-	P 0								•	respons				_	,
				I 0		O+1	her					2	TCCCOID	LO 1	Je bigi			
				? 0		001						-						

Course-Section: PSYC 606 0101 University of Maryland Title ADULT PSYCHOPATHOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO Spring 2009

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 1375

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	-	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	vou gain n	ew insights,ski	=	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	2		1248/1576	3.89	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.89
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	2	1	4	2		1166/1342	3.67	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.67
		uations reflect			0	0	0	1	1	5	2		1179/1520	3.89	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.89
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.67
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1289/1434	3.33	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.33
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly	y explai	ined	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.67
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	827/1554	4.14	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.14
		Lecture																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	1	3	4	0		1411/1488		4.39		4.52	3.38
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	4	3		1355/1493	4.25	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.25
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	1	1		1367/1486	3.38	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.38
		es contribute to			1	0	0	1	1	2			1050/1489	4.13		4.32	4.38	4.13
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enl	hance yo	our understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	963/1277	3.63	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.63
		D!																
1 543		Discus		3	0	0	0	1	0	_	2	4 11	764/1070	4 11	4 00	4 1 7	1 21	4 11
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5 2	3 6	4.11	764/1279 597/1270	4.11 4.56	4.08	4.17	4.53	4.11 4.56
				d to participate d open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.56	694/1269		4.33	4.35		4.56
		echniques succes		open discussion	0	4	1	0	1	1	2		688/ 878		3.86	4.35		3.60
4. Welt	e special t	ecilitques succes	SSIUI		U	4	1	U	Т	Т	2	3.00	000/ 0/0	3.00	3.00	4.05	4.11	3.00
				Freq	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credita	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	oe			Majors	\$
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	e	7	Majo	r	0
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	9
84-15		3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					7						
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 616 0101 University of Maryland MEAS APPL BEHAV AN BORRERO, JOHN

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1376

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.32	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.75
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.60
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	122/1465	4.90	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.90
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learne	0 £	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	243/1434	4.70	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.70
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.80
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
				hing effectivenes	s 0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.70	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.70
		Lectur	0															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		nrenared	Ω	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1486		4.28	4.32	4.37	4.70
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489		4.26	4.32	4.38	4.90
				our understanding	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	243/1277		4.03	4.03	4.08	4.63
3. 21a aa		1 000111114400 011	1	our under bounding	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü		J	1.05	213,12,,	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.00	1.05
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.90
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.70
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.80
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		0	2	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.75
				Fre	quency	, Die	trib	utio	n									
				116	quenc	, DIS	CLID	uc10										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grade	S			Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	5	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot	her					8	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 621 0101 University of Maryland Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT

Ι

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1377

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

INGRAM, JOYCE

								Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 l															
1. D	id you	gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.25
			tor make clear			0	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1567/1576	2.50	4.19	4.27	4.32	2.50
3. I	id the	exam qu	estions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1323/1342	2.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	2.75
4. E	id oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.75
5. I	id ass	igned re	adings contribu	ate to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1337/1465	3.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.25
6. I	oid wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.25
7. W	as the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1543/1547	1.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	1.75
8. H	low man	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1567/1574	3.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	3.00
9. H	Iow wou	ld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1537/1554	2.33	4.01	4.10	4.18	2.33
	Lecture																		
1. W	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1470/1488	2.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	2.75					
			tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.00
					explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1455/1486	2.75	4.28	4.32	4.37	2.75
4. E	id the	lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1466/1489	2.50	4.26	4.32	4.38	2.50
5. I	id aud	iovisual	techniques enl	nance :	your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.00
			Discuss	sion															
1. E	id cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1129/1279	3.33	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.33
					ed to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.33
					nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.00
					Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
<b>G</b>	12 to		Com CD3		Property of Consider				D					т.				26	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade									Rea	sons				Ту	ре 			Majors	; 
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																			
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	4
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																			
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 1 F 0							Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh

Other

4

Course-Section: PSYC 653 0101 University of Maryland Title CULTURAL HUM DEVEL CHEAH, CHARISSA 11 Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1378

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11		-
Questionnaires:	11	Student Cours	e Evaluation Questionnaire

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 500/1576 4.60 4.24 4 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.10 1076/1576 4.10 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 1 3 4 3.80 1232/1520 3.80 4.17 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 304/1465 4.60 4.08 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 304/1465 4.60 4.08 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 2 4 4.00 878/1434 4.00 4.09 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 1 1 5 3.70 1259/1547 3.70 4.18 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 557/1493 4.90 4.67 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1486 5.00 4.28 4	UMBC Level Sect Mean Mean Mean  4.30 4.43 4.60 4.27 4.32 4.10 4.25 4.36 3.80 4.12 4.25 4.60 4.14 4.35 4.00 4.19 4.24 3.70 4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11  4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00 4.32 4.38 4.60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 500/1576 4.60 4.24 4 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.10 1076/1576 4.10 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 1 3 4 3.80 1232/1520 3.80 4.17 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 304/1465 4.60 4.08 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 2 4 4.00 878/1434 4.00 4.09 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 1 1 5 3.70 1259/1547 3.70 4.18 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.00 1554 4.11 4.01 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4.27 4.32 4.10 4.25 4.36 3.80 4.12 4.25 4.60 4.14 4.35 4.00 4.19 4.24 3.70 4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 500/1576 4.60 4.24 4 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.10 1076/1576 4.10 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 1 3 4 3.80 1232/1520 3.80 4.17 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 304/1465 4.60 4.08 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 2 4 4.00 878/1434 4.00 4.09 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 1 1 5 3.70 1259/1547 3.70 4.18 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 0.00 4 0	4.27 4.32 4.10 4.25 4.36 3.80 4.12 4.25 4.60 4.14 4.35 4.00 4.19 4.24 3.70 4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.10 1076/1576 4.10 4.19 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 1 3 4 3.80 1232/1520 3.80 4.17 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 304/1465 4.60 4.08 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 2 4 4.00 878/1434 4.00 4.09 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 1 1 5 3.70 1259/1547 3.70 4.18 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 0.00	4.27 4.32 4.10 4.25 4.36 3.80 4.12 4.25 4.60 4.14 4.35 4.00 4.19 4.24 3.70 4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 1 1 3 4 3.80 1232/1520 3.80 4.17 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 304/1465 4.60 4.08 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 2 4 4.00 878/1434 4.00 4.09 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 1 1 5 3.70 1259/1547 3.70 4.18 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 0.00 4	4.12 4.25 4.60 4.14 4.35 4.00 4.19 4.24 3.70 4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 2 4 4.00 878/1434 4.00 4.09 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 1 1 5 3.70 1259/1547 3.70 4.18 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 0 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.70 624/1488 4.70 4.39 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4.14 4.35 4.00 4.19 4.24 3.70 4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 1 1 5 3.70 1259/1547 3.70 4.18 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.10 1.10 1	4.19 4.24 3.70 4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 9 1 4.10 1424/1574 4.10 4.67 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4 1.01 4	4.64 4.75 4.10 4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 860/1554 4.11 4.01 4  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.70 624/1488 4.70 4.39 4  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 557/1493 4.90 4.67 4  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1486 5.00 4.28 4	4.10 4.18 4.11 4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 557/1493 4.90 4.67 4.39 4.30 4.67 4.30 4.28 4.30 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.2	4.47 4.52 4.70 4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.70 624/1488 4.70 4.39 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 557/1493 4.90 4.67 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1486 5.00 4.28 4	4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 9 \ 4.90 \ 557/1493 \ 4.90 \ 4.67 \ 4$ 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly $1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 10 \ 5.00 \ 1/1486 \ 5.00 \ 4.28 \ 4$	4.73 4.80 4.90 4.32 4.37 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1486 5.00 4.28 4	4.32 4.37 5.00
	4.32 4.38 4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4.03 4.08 4.11
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 4 5 $4.40$ $554/1279$ $4.40$ $4.08$ 4	4.17 4.34 4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 260/1270 4.90 4.33 4	4.35 4.53 4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 278/1269 4.90 4.33 4	4.35 4.55 4.90
4. Were special techniques successful 1 8 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 878 **** 3.86 4	4.05 4.11 ****
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.71 4	4.72 4.79 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 79 **** 4.54 4	4.69 4.77 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.71 4	4.64 4.70 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.37 4	4.61 4.70 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.61 4	4.01 4.10 ****
Self Paced	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students $10  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 382  **** 5.00  4$	4.08 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 9	Major 0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1	
	Non-major 11
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	
Grad. 9 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are	_
P 0 responses to be signif	ilcant
I 0 Other 9	
? 0	

Course-Section: PSYC 665 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVSEM:DRUGS AND BEHAV Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 1379 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DEFULLI, ANTHON

Enrollment: 17
Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 4 9 4.38 818/1576 4.38 4.24 4.30 4.43 4.38 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 5 7 4.13 1058/1576 4.13 4.19 4.27 4.32 4.13 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 6 4 6 4.00 972/1342 4.00 4.17 4.32 4.38 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 880/1520 4.23 4.17 4.25 4.36 4.23 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5 10 4.56 328/1465 4.56 4.08 4.12 4.25 4.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 1 1 2 5 4.22 716/1434 4.22 4.09 4.14 4.35 4.22 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 5 10 4.50 527/1547 4.50 4.18 4.19 4.24 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 328/1574 4.94 4.67 4.64 4.75 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 4 3 4 4.00 924/1554 4.00 4.01 4.10 4.18 4.00Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 505/1488 4.75 4.39 4.47 4.52 4.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 632/1493 4.88 4.67 4.73 4.80 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 7 9 4.56 607/1486 4.56 4.28 4.32 4.37 4.56 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 378/1489 4.75 4.26 4.32 4.38 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 4 11 4.73 170/1277 4.73 4.03 4.03 4.08 4.73 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 6 7 4.43 532/1279 4.43 4.08 4.17 4.34 4.43 3 10 4.64 523/1270 4.64 4.33 4.35 4.53 4.64 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 409/1269 4.79 4.33 4.35 4.55 4.79 4. Were special techniques successful 3 4 0 1 1 0 7 4.44 258/878 4.44 3.86 4.05 4.11 4.44 Seminar 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 375 \*\*\*\* 4.61 4.01 4.10 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear

#### -

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: PSYC 669 0101

Title ORGANIZ BEH MGMNT

Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1380 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	6	2	2 22	1494/1576	3.57	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	9	7	5		1292/1576	3.81	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	Ω	4	7		1150/1342	3.52	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	6		1251/1520	3.93	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	U	2	5	10	4		1095/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	9	4		1167/1434	3.90	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	351/1547	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	U	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	7	3		1166/1554		4.01	4.10		3.75
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circumstances	5	O	U	_	5	,	J	3.73	1100/1331	3.70	1.01	1.10	1.10	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	786/1488	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	1039/1486	4.02	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1096/1489	3.86	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	3	5	5	6	3.74	902/1277	3.92	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	6	4	3	3.05	1179/1279	3.26	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	4	3	9	3.89	1008/1270	4.35	4.33	4.35	4.53	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	917/1269	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	676/ 878	3.74	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.64

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 669 8620

22

ORGANIZ BEH MGMNT

ROSEN, THEODORE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

Page 1381 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	n er		MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 1	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	-	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Question	12												Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	lls fro	m this course	2	0	1	0	5	10	4	3.80	1325/1576	3.57	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.80
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	6	10	4	3.81	1292/1576	3.81	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.81
		uestions reflec			1	2	1	3	7	5	3		1258/1342		4.17	4.32	4.38	3.32
		uations reflect			1	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	998/1520		4.17	4.25	4.36	4.10
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	668/1465		4.08	4.12	4.25	4.24
	_	-		o what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	748/1434		4.09	4.14	4.35	4.19
		g system clear		-	2	0	1	2	2	7	8		1093/1547		4.18	4.19	4.24	3.95
	_	was class cand			2	1	0	1	0	9	9		1236/1574		4.67	4.64	4.75	4.37
				hing effectiveness	4	1	0	3	3	8			1240/1554		4.01	4.10		3.65
	200																	
		Lectui																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	1	0	2	1	1	6	11	4.10	1206/1488	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.10	
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared I the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	2	3	16		1053/1493		4.67	4.73	4.80	4.67
	lecture material presented and explained clea					0	1	2	3	7	8		1197/1486		4.28	4.32	4.37	3.90
		you learned	1	0	1	2	5	8	5		1283/1489		4.26	4.32	4.38	3.67		
				our understanding	1	0	0	1	6		10		656/1277		4.03	4.03	4.08	4.10
													,					
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	5	6	5	5	3.48	1076/1279	3.26	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.48
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81			4.33	4.35	4.53	4.81
		-	_	d open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	4	15	4.48	669/1269	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.48
		echniques succe		or of an annual and	1	2	0	4	2	6	7	3.84				4.05		3.84
		1000																
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 16		Red	 quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	`====	2	Graduat	 e 1	.0	Majo	 or	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			-			,						,		
56-83	5 1 2.00 1.77 0 2 2					Gei	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0												J				-	
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00						ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	rh
	-			P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Otl	her				1	2			– 3		-	
				? 0							_							

Course-Section: PSYC 686 0101 University of Maryland Title ETHICAL & PRO ISSUES

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: BARNETT, JEFF

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Page 1382 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Mean Mean Mean Mean

			Fre	equer	cies	5		Instr	ructor	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	
General										

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342	4.89	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	149/1520	4.89	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	678/1465	4.22	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	360/1434	4.56	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1547	4.78	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.78	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.89	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	4.03	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.70	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: PSYC 710 0101

13

RESEARCH METHODS

MURPHY, CHRISTO

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2009

Page 1383

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 l															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1231/1576	3.92	4.24	4.30		3.92
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	6	4		1023/1576		4.19	4.27		4.17
		uestions reflect			0	11	0	0	0	1	0		****/1342		4.17	4.32	4.38	****
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	5	6		665/1520			4.25	4.36	4.42
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	1		1355/1465		4.08	4.12	4.25	3.17
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10		193/1434		4.09	4.14	4.35	4.75
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1376/1547	3.42	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.42
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.92
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.00
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	prepared	1	0	0	1	6	4	0	3.27	1426/1488	3.27	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.27	
2. Did th	ne instruc	n the subject	2	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1401/1493	4.10	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.10		
3. Was le	cture mat	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1265/1486	3.73	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.73		
4. Did th	ne lecture	you learned	1	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1329/1489	3.45	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.45		
5. Did au	old the lectures contribute to what you learned old audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					2	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1114/1277	3.22	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.22
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	774/1279	4.09	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.09
				d to participate	1		0	0	1			4.45					4.53	
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	5	6						4.55	
		echniques succes			1	8	1	0	0	2	0	3.00					4.11	
				Frequ	encs	, Dis	trib	ıtioı	า									
				11040	iciic j	DID	CIID	20101	-									
Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 е	9	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0												_		
56-83	200 2.00					Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	12
84-150	0	D 0									_				-			
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot!	her				1	2	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: PSYC 711 0101 University of Maryland Title DATA ANALYTIC PROCED I

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0

4. Were special techniques successful

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1384 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR

Enrollment: 17 Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 114/1576 4.94 4.24 4.30 4.43 4.94 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 279/1576 4.75 4.19 4.27 4.32 4.75 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 275/1342 4.78 4.17 4.32 4.38 4.78 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 7 7 4.25 859/1520 4.25 4.17 4.25 4.36 4.25 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 2 2 7 3 3.44 1277/1465 3.44 4.08 4.12 4.25 3.44 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 6 8 4.33 594/1434 4.33 4.09 4.14 4.35 4.337. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 141/1547 4.88 4.18 4.19 4.24 4.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 9 7 4.44 1165/1574 4.44 4.67 4.64 4.75 4.44 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 4.49/1554 4.47 4.01 4.10 4.18 4.47Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 3 2 10 4.47 920/1488 4.47 4.39 4.47 4.52 4.47 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 810/1493 4.80 4.67 4.73 4.80 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 2 6 7 4.33 891/1486 4.33 4.28 4.37 4.33 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 434/1489 4.71 4.26 4.32 4.38 4.71 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0 2 6 5 4.23 551/1277 4.23 4.03 4.03 4.08 4.23 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 0 7 7 4.27 657/1279 4.27 4.08 4.17 4.34 4.27 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 4 1 10 4.40 736/1270 4.40 4.33 4.35 4.53 4.40

# 1 1 Frequency Distribution

0

0 2 3 9 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.33 4.35 4.55 4.50

0 4 5 3 3.50 709/878 3.50 3.86 4.05 4.11 3.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 711L 0101

DATA ANALY. PROCED. II

Title Instructor: SHEPERD, KELLY

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1385 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questi en s	MD	3.7.7	Fre	equer			_		ructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	904/1576	4.29	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	581/1576	4.53	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1342	4.83	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	592/1547	4.47	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	886/1554	4.08	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.43
Discussion			_		_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	2	2		1000/1279	3.67	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	***	3.86	4.05	4.11	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.00	157/ 234	4.00	4.03	4.23	4.36	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	4	_	4.65	71/ 240	4.65	4.19	4.35	4.37	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	133/ 229	4.50	4.44	4.51	4.51	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.71	66/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.47	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	8	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	55/ 379	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.37	
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	U	O	O	O	O	3	O	1.07	33/ 3/2	1.07	1.33	1.20	1.57	1.07
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	oe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	13	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 736 0101

Title APPL PSYC AND PUBLIC P

Instructor: MATON, KENNETH

Enrollment:

8 Questionnaires: 7

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1386 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.24	4.30	4.43	1 06
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 5	4.80	203/15/6	4.88	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.86 4.83
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	5	0	0	0	1	5 1	4.83	583/1342	4.83	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.17	4.32	4.36	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	<i>5</i>	4.14	159/1465	4.14	4.17	4.12	4.25	4.14
3 3	1	0	0	-	0	_	2		1045/1434				4.25	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4 1	1	4.33	,	3.83	4.09	4.14		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	T	0	U T	4 6	5.00	755/1547	4.33	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	U T	0	-	-	-	-	-		1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	339/1554	4.57	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	0	0	1		1149/1277	3.00	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.00
5. Did dddiovibddi ceeimiqdeb eimanee your anderbeanding	o	3	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1110/12//	3.00	1.05	1.05	1.00	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.71	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	43/ 79	4.80	4.54	4.69	4.77	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.71	4.64	4.70	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	45/ 80	4.60	4.37	4.61	4.70	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/ 375	4.80	4.61	4.01	4.10	4.80

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