

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 30
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	7	8	13	4.10	1115/1674	4.28	4.51	4.27	4.07	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	8	17	4.38	776/1674	4.37	4.48	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	9	17	4.30	803/1423	4.24	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	0	9	15	4.30	799/1609	4.47	4.59	4.22	4.05	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	8	4	17	4.31	502/1585	4.41	4.45	3.96	3.88	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	11	13	4.00	870/1535	4.15	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	372/1651	4.56	4.50	4.18	4.10	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	2	11	14	4.32	1368/1673	4.51	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	561/1656	4.19	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	23	4.69	633/1586	4.73	4.72	4.43	4.37	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	24	4.72	981/1585	4.86	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	7	20	4.55	578/1582	4.66	4.59	4.26	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	3	22	4.45	768/1575	4.61	4.67	4.27	4.17	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	4	1	7	16	4.14	594/1380	4.50	4.29	3.94	3.78	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	8	12	4.27	626/1520	4.51	4.56	4.01	3.76	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	3	16	4.43	720/1515	4.65	4.70	4.24	3.97	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	0	20	4.61	563/1511	4.74	4.79	4.27	4.00	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	4.07	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.79	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.87	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.80	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.73	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 30
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	30	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 31
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	687/1674	4.28	4.51	4.27	4.07	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	790/1674	4.37	4.48	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	901/1423	4.24	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	343/1609	4.47	4.59	4.22	4.05	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	326/1585	4.41	4.45	3.96	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	608/1535	4.15	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	524/1651	4.56	4.50	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1040/1673	4.51	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	955/1656	4.19	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	453/1586	4.73	4.72	4.43	4.37	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	4.86	4.87	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	286/1582	4.66	4.59	4.26	4.17	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.61	4.67	4.27	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.50	4.29	3.94	3.78	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	229/1520	4.51	4.56	4.01	3.76	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.65	4.70	4.24	3.97	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.74	4.79	4.27	4.00	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	4.07	3.94	3.73	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 100H 0101
 Title IDEAS IN AMER CULT-HON
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 32
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.48	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	157/1609	4.83	4.59	4.22	4.05	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	121/1585	4.83	4.45	3.96	3.88	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1651	4.92	4.50	4.18	4.10	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	706/1673	4.91	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.72	4.43	4.37	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.59	4.26	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.67	4.27	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	341/1380	4.45	4.29	3.94	3.78	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	454/1520	4.45	4.56	4.01	3.76	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.70	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	614/ 994	3.80	4.07	3.94	3.73	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 33
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.07	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	110/1674	4.93	4.48	4.23	4.16	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1423	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	192/1609	4.79	4.59	4.22	4.05	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	462/1585	4.36	4.45	3.96	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	197/1651	4.79	4.50	4.18	4.10	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.46	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	230/1656	4.77	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	171/1586	4.97	4.72	4.43	4.37	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.81	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	199/1582	4.79	4.59	4.26	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	311/1575	4.93	4.67	4.27	4.17	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	253/1380	4.58	4.29	3.94	3.78	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	120/1520	4.92	4.56	4.01	3.76	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.70	4.24	3.97	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	351/ 994	4.27	4.07	3.94	3.73	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.79	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.87	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.80	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.73	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 33
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 34
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.07	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	110/1674	4.93	4.48	4.23	4.16	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1423	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	192/1609	4.79	4.59	4.22	4.05	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	462/1585	4.36	4.45	3.96	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	197/1651	4.79	4.50	4.18	4.10	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.46	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	4.77	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	4.97	4.72	4.43	4.37	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.81	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.79	4.59	4.26	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	4.93	4.67	4.27	4.17	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1380	4.58	4.29	3.94	3.78	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	120/1520	4.92	4.56	4.01	3.76	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.70	4.24	3.97	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	351/ 994	4.27	4.07	3.94	3.73	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.79	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.87	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.80	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.73	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 34
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 35
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	195/1674	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.07	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	110/1674	4.93	4.48	4.23	4.16	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1423	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	192/1609	4.79	4.59	4.22	4.05	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	462/1585	4.36	4.45	3.96	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.45	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	197/1651	4.79	4.50	4.18	4.10	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1246/1673	4.46	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	4.77	4.39	4.07	3.96	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1586	4.97	4.72	4.43	4.37	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.81	4.87	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.79	4.59	4.26	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	4.93	4.67	4.27	4.17	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1380	4.58	4.29	3.94	3.78	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	120/1520	4.92	4.56	4.01	3.76	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	207/1515	4.90	4.70	4.24	3.97	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	351/ 994	4.27	4.07	3.94	3.73	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.79	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	****	4.87	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.80	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.73	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 35
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: WALLACE, KENDRA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 36
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.48	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1423	4.88	4.51	4.27	4.36	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	121/1609	4.91	4.59	4.22	4.23	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.45	3.96	3.91	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.45	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.50	4.18	4.20	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1646/1673	3.70	4.64	4.69	4.67	3.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.39	4.07	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.72	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.59	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	268/1575	4.82	4.67	4.27	4.39	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	110/1380	4.82	4.29	3.94	4.03	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.56	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.70	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	270/ 994	4.43	4.07	3.94	3.98	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 37
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	521/1674	4.57	4.51	4.27	4.32	4.57		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	14	11	4.21	980/1674	4.21	4.48	4.23	4.26	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.51	4.27	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	14	10	4.18	952/1609	4.18	4.59	4.22	4.23	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	18	4.43	395/1585	4.43	4.45	3.96	3.91	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	15	4.44	454/1535	4.44	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	12	8	3.93	1201/1651	3.93	4.50	4.18	4.20	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	15	9	4.32	628/1656	4.32	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	10	13	4.26	1144/1586	4.26	4.72	4.43	4.48	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.87	4.69	4.76	4.93		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	924/1582	4.27	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	10	14	4.32	895/1575	4.32	4.67	4.27	4.39	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	18	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1142/1380	3.30	4.29	3.94	4.03	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	21	4.57	355/1520	4.57	4.56	4.01	4.03	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.70	4.24	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	335/1511	4.82	4.79	4.27	4.28	4.82		
4. Were special techniques successful	0	17	1	2	3	1	4	3.45	758/ 994	3.45	4.07	3.94	3.98	3.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 18	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 38
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1674	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.32	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1001/1674	4.33	4.48	4.23	4.26	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.59	4.22	4.23	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	265/1585	4.61	4.45	3.96	3.91	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	283/1535	4.68	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	673/1651	4.35	4.50	4.18	4.20	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.44	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	381/1656	4.60	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.87	4.72	4.43	4.48	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	632/1582	4.52	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	279/1575	4.82	4.67	4.27	4.39	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	817/1380	3.72	4.29	3.94	4.03	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	134/1520	4.57	4.56	4.01	4.03	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	325/1515	4.82	4.70	4.24	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	244/1511	4.91	4.79	4.27	4.28	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	107/ 994	4.66	4.07	3.94	3.98	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	36/ 103	4.86	4.79	4.41	4.07	4.86	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	39/ 101	4.88	4.87	4.48	4.45	4.88	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	35/ 95	4.75	4.80	4.31	4.33	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	38/ 99	4.75	4.73	4.39	4.22	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	31/ 97	4.75	4.80	4.14	4.63	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 290 0201
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 39
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	287/1674	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.32	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	641/1674	4.33	4.48	4.23	4.26	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	282/1609	4.70	4.59	4.22	4.23	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	258/1585	4.61	4.45	3.96	3.91	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	161/1535	4.68	4.45	4.08	4.03	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	809/1651	4.35	4.50	4.18	4.20	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1325/1673	4.44	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	230/1656	4.60	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	336/1586	4.87	4.72	4.43	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	589/1582	4.52	4.59	4.26	4.35	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	246/1575	4.82	4.67	4.27	4.39	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1017/1380	3.72	4.29	3.94	4.03	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	645/1520	4.57	4.56	4.01	4.03	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	289/1515	4.82	4.70	4.24	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	219/1511	4.91	4.79	4.27	4.28	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	189/ 994	4.66	4.07	3.94	3.98	4.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	4.86	4.79	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.88	4.87	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	4.75	4.80	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	4.75	4.73	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	4.75	4.80	4.14	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 40
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	14	13	4.08	1131/1674	4.06	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	22	4.47	625/1674	4.35	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	23	4.58	482/1423	4.49	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	24	4.61	363/1609	4.48	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	7	8	13	3.69	1107/1585	3.70	4.45	3.96	3.95	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	10	10	14	4.12	817/1535	4.04	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	7	8	20	4.37	713/1651	4.31	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	31	4.83	850/1673	4.87	4.64	4.69	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	7	11	9	4.07	912/1656	4.12	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	11	18	4.34	1064/1586	4.42	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	28	4.80	811/1585	4.74	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	16	17	4.43	748/1582	4.52	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	10	22	4.54	646/1575	4.52	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	10	23	4.65	213/1380	4.66	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	4	9	12	4.23	663/1520	4.04	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	778/1515	4.30	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	4	4	17	4.42	729/1511	4.42	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	699/ 994	3.74	4.07	3.94	3.96	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 10	C 4	General	12
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 35
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: AMST 320 0201
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 41
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	7	11	14	4.03	1179/1674	4.06	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	9	18	4.23	968/1674	4.35	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	10	21	4.40	697/1423	4.49	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	10	20	4.34	729/1609	4.48	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	6	9	9	11	3.71	1084/1585	3.70	4.45	3.96	3.95	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	17	10	3.97	915/1535	4.04	4.45	4.08	4.15	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	12	17	4.26	866/1651	4.31	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	635/1673	4.87	4.64	4.69	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	5	14	10	4.17	816/1656	4.12	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	8	22	4.50	858/1586	4.42	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	27	4.68	1059/1585	4.74	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	7	25	4.62	510/1582	4.52	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	24	4.50	692/1575	4.52	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	9	24	4.68	193/1380	4.66	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	7	8	9	3.85	955/1520	4.04	4.56	4.01	4.09	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	3	9	13	4.22	922/1515	4.30	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	4	4	18	4.41	751/1511	4.42	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	2	5	8	9	3.88	577/ 994	3.74	4.07	3.94	3.96	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.79	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.87	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.80	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.73	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: AMST 320 0201
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 41
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	35	Non-major	29
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 322 0101
 Title AMER SOCY & CULT IN FI
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 42
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	16	12	4.15	1075/1674	4.15	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	15	15	4.32	843/1674	4.32	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	728/1423	4.38	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	12	17	4.44	598/1609	4.44	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	9	17	4.21	593/1585	4.21	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	13	14	4.18	747/1535	4.18	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	3	14	14	4.21	912/1651	4.21	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	850/1673	4.82	4.64	4.69	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	16	7	4.07	912/1656	4.07	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	9	20	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	567/1585	4.91	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	14	16	4.41	777/1582	4.41	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	14	16	4.41	819/1575	4.41	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	110/1380	4.81	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	12	14	4.19	700/1520	4.19	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	396/1515	4.74	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	391/1511	4.77	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	20	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	4.07	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General	12
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 325 0101
 Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 43
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	7	16	4.34	841/1674	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.34	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	12	13	4.24	943/1674	4.31	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	943/1423	4.13	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	408/1609	4.52	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	442/1585	4.44	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	9	13	4.26	667/1535	4.46	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	8	16	4.39	686/1651	4.32	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	901/1673	4.90	4.64	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	12	6	4.00	955/1656	4.27	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	805/1586	4.70	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	832/1585	4.82	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	11	14	4.28	914/1582	4.48	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	17	4.45	768/1575	4.65	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	0	2	5	10	4.11	622/1380	4.10	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	11	11	4.15	743/1520	4.30	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	10	14	4.41	759/1515	4.36	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	507/1511	4.56	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	5	2	1	5	6	3.26	832/ 994	3.38	4.07	3.94	3.96	3.26	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General	11
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 325 8020
 Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 44
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	891/1674	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	763/1674	4.31	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1423	4.13	4.51	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	552/1609	4.52	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	326/1585	4.44	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	238/1535	4.46	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	866/1651	4.32	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.90	4.64	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	359/1656	4.27	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	319/1586	4.70	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	713/1585	4.82	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	394/1582	4.48	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	235/1575	4.65	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	626/1380	4.10	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	443/1520	4.30	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	857/1515	4.36	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	685/1511	4.56	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	732/ 994	3.38	4.07	3.94	3.96	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AMST 357 0101
 Title SP TOPICS:COMM,MEDIA,A
 Instructor: Moffitt, Kimber
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 45
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	941/1674	4.27	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	705/1674	4.43	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	455/1609	4.53	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	655/1535	4.27	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	10	4	1	3.40	1654/1673	3.40	4.64	4.69	4.68	3.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	744/1656	4.23	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1575	4.92	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	986/1380	3.63	4.29	3.94	4.01	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	134/1520	4.91	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	313/1515	4.82	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	244/1511	4.91	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	445/ 994	4.10	4.07	3.94	3.96	4.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101
 Title COMMUNITY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 46
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	1004/1674	4.22	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	10	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	718/1423	4.39	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	771/1609	4.32	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	14	4.35	472/1585	4.35	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	608/1535	4.30	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	3	6	10	3.83	1276/1651	3.83	4.50	4.18	4.16	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	894/1656	4.10	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	7	14	4.43	960/1586	4.43	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	20	4.74	960/1585	4.74	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	882/1582	4.30	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	11	4.22	992/1575	4.22	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	2	10	8	3.91	783/1380	3.91	4.29	3.94	4.01	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	7	9	4.11	777/1520	4.11	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	513/1515	4.63	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	586/1511	4.58	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	3	1	1	6	7	3.72	652/ 994	3.72	4.07	3.94	3.96	3.72	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 13	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 382 0101
 Title: PERSPECTIVES ON FAMILY
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 47
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	458/1674	4.63	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	471/1674	4.59	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	728/1423	4.38	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	319/1585	4.52	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	292/1535	4.59	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	406/1651	4.59	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	1114/1673	4.63	4.64	4.69	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	655/1656	4.30	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	896/1585	4.77	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	2	19	4.54	599/1582	4.54	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	509/1575	4.65	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	392/1380	4.38	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	281/1520	4.68	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	408/1515	4.74	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	312/1511	4.84	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	351/ 994	4.27	4.07	3.94	3.96	4.27	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: AMST 388 0101
 Title LANDSCAPE & CULTURE
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 48
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	878/1674	4.32	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	790/1674	4.37	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	551/1423	4.53	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	536/1609	4.47	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	283/1585	4.58	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	481/1535	4.42	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	643/1651	4.42	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	724/1673	4.89	4.64	4.69	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	1	10	3	3.93	1073/1656	3.93	4.39	4.07	4.07	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	708/1586	4.63	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	591/1585	4.89	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	819/1582	4.37	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	857/1575	4.37	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	371/1380	4.41	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	330/1520	4.61	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	611/1515	4.53	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	266/1511	4.89	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	369/ 994	4.24	4.07	3.94	3.96	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.79	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.87	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.80	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.73	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: AMST 388 0101
 Title LANDSCAPE & CULTURE
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 48
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101
 Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 49
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	419/1674	4.73	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	460/1674	4.66	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	528/1423	4.56	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	343/1609	4.68	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	204/1585	4.80	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	328/1535	4.68	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	145/1651	4.83	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	354/1586	4.75	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	615/1585	4.94	4.87	4.69	4.66	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	299/1582	4.63	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	192/1575	4.82	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	253/1380	4.58	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	94/1520	4.90	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	254/1515	4.79	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1511	4.79	4.79	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	174/ 994	4.67	4.07	3.94	3.96	4.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 391 0201
 Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 50
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	233/1674	4.73	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1674	4.66	4.48	4.23	4.21	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	493/1423	4.56	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	252/1609	4.68	4.59	4.22	4.27	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	86/1585	4.80	4.45	3.96	3.95	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	127/1535	4.68	4.45	4.08	4.15	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	169/1651	4.83	4.50	4.18	4.16	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.39	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	663/1586	4.75	4.72	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1585	4.94	4.87	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1582	4.63	4.59	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	359/1575	4.82	4.67	4.27	4.25	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	259/1380	4.58	4.29	3.94	4.01	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1520	4.90	4.56	4.01	4.09	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	432/1515	4.79	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	586/1511	4.79	4.79	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.67	4.07	3.94	3.96	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 51
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	533/1674	4.56	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	298/1423	4.73	4.51	4.27	4.34	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	374/1609	4.60	4.59	4.22	4.30	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	265/1585	4.60	4.45	3.96	4.01	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	268/1535	4.63	4.45	4.08	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	673/1651	4.40	4.50	4.18	4.23	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	760/1673	4.88	4.64	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	451/1656	4.45	4.39	4.07	4.19	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	171/1586	4.93	4.72	4.43	4.46	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	453/1585	4.93	4.87	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.59	4.26	4.31	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	523/1575	4.64	4.67	4.27	4.35	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	426/1380	4.33	4.29	3.94	4.04	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	572/1520	4.33	4.56	4.01	4.18	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	560/1515	4.58	4.70	4.24	4.40	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.79	4.27	4.45	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	4.07	3.94	4.19	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	44/ 103	4.71	4.79	4.41	4.42	4.71	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	41/ 101	4.86	4.87	4.48	4.65	4.86	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 95	4.86	4.80	4.31	4.60	4.86	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	41/ 99	4.71	4.73	4.39	4.57	4.71	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	28/ 97	4.86	4.80	4.14	4.46	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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