

Course Section: ART 210 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 66
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1077/1669	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1094/1666	3.74	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	1	4	8	4.06	993/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1555	2.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	5	3	3	1	1	2.23	1531/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	2.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	1321/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.71	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	0	0	6	2	3.60	1312/1605	3.47	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1255/1514	3.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	788/1551	4.78	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1245/1503	3.40	4.22	4.24	4.29	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	7	4	3.73	1250/1506	3.43	4.20	4.26	4.33	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	470/1311	4.15	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	535/1490	4.01	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	504/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	986/1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	810/1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	13				
				?	1						

Course Section: ART 210 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 67
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	988/1669	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1432/1666	3.74	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1235/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.24	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1555	2.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	3	3	3	0	1	2.30	1527/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	2.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	3	2	4	1	2.77	1559/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.19	2.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.71	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.47	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	3	0	0	2	2.83	1477/1514	3.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	2.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.78	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1442/1503	3.40	4.22	4.24	4.29	2.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1450/1506	3.43	4.20	4.26	4.33	2.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1311	4.15	4.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1022/1490	4.01	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	486/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	936/1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 68
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1307/1669	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1417/1666	3.74	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1029/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	7	4	0	2.80	1482/1555	2.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	3	2	3	1	2.54	1511/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	2.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1241/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1464/1668	4.71	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1164/1605	3.47	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1182/1514	3.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1000/1551	4.78	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1301/1503	3.40	4.22	4.24	4.29	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	1069/1506	3.43	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	547/1311	4.15	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	998/1490	4.01	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	781/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	765/1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	917/1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 68
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 69
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	734/1669	4.51	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	605/1666	4.66	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	939/1421	4.15	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	242/1617	4.61	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	2	5	3.73	1079/1555	3.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	3.78	3.85	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	907/1647	4.35	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	13	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.33	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	799/1514	4.53	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	954/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	686/1503	4.51	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	744/1506	4.41	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	163/1311	4.40	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	622/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.72	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.64	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	235/1006	3.96	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	676/1669	4.51	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	319/1666	4.66	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	1195/1421	4.15	4.47	4.24	4.35	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	612/1617	4.61	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	8	5	3.74	1079/1555	3.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1138/1543	3.78	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	401/1647	4.35	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	15	3	4.05	1503/1668	4.33	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	499/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	923/1514	4.53	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	0	16	4.63	1069/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	425/1503	4.51	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	1	12	4.26	901/1506	4.41	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	2	13	4.42	319/1311	4.40	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	5	8	4.13	786/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	522/1502	4.72	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	574/1489	4.64	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	823/1006	3.96	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ART 211 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 70
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 211 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 71
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	10	4.67	389/1669	4.51	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	181/1666	4.66	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	242/1421	4.15	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1617	4.61	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	889/1555	3.80	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	3	3.80	1101/1543	3.78	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	851/1647	4.35	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.33	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	499/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	584/1514	4.53	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	917/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	621/1503	4.51	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	613/1506	4.41	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	552/1311	4.40	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	356/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	438/1502	4.72	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	553/1489	4.64	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	479/1006	3.96	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 212 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: DROGOUL, LAURE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 72
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1596/1669	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1421	3.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1579/1617	3.63	4.30	4.15	4.24	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1553/1555	3.11	3.73	4.00	3.96	1.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	5	2	0	0	0	1.29	1542/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	1.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1560/1647	3.03	3.97	4.12	4.19	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1611/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.59	3.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1428/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1490/1514	3.60	4.26	4.39	4.39	2.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1452/1551	4.46	4.74	4.66	4.72	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	1466/1503	3.60	4.22	4.24	4.29	2.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	0	0	2.43	1467/1506	3.45	4.20	4.26	4.33	2.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	4	2	0	1	2.71	1203/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.96	2.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	0	4	0	2.75	1404/1490	3.74	4.17	4.05	4.11	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1208/1502	4.16	4.37	4.26	4.31	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	3	2	0	3	3.38	1328/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.36	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1002/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	1.86	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	9	Non-major
					7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 212 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: DROGOUL, LAURE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 73
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	2	4	5	1	2.93	1610/1669	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	2.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	3	0	2.53	1634/1666	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.29	2.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1421	3.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	6	2	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.63	4.30	4.15	4.24	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1555	3.11	3.73	4.00	3.96	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	4	2	1	1	0	1.88	1537/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	1.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	5	3	4	0	1	2.15	1616/1647	3.03	3.97	4.12	4.19	2.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1498/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	2	4	4	0	2.69	1546/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	2.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	0	5	5	0	2.79	1479/1514	3.60	4.26	4.39	4.39	2.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1193/1551	4.46	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	2	5	2	3.07	1418/1503	3.60	4.22	4.24	4.29	3.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	3	5	0	2.57	1450/1506	3.45	4.20	4.26	4.33	2.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	861/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.96	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1112/1490	3.74	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	944/1502	4.16	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	818/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	738/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	0			

Course Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 74
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	500/1669	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	676/1666	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	3.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	219/1617	3.63	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	541/1555	3.11	3.73	4.00	3.96	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1223/1647	3.03	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	666/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1514	3.60	4.26	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	4.46	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	277/1503	3.60	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	147/1506	3.45	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	400/1490	3.74	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.16	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	479/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 0
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
			? 1		

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	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1387/1669	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1273/1666	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1135/1421	3.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	987/1617	3.63	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1192/1555	3.11	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1019/1543	2.36	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	3	3	3	3.38	1449/1647	3.03	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	1353/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1249/1605	3.50	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1118/1514	3.60	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1193/1551	4.46	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	1066/1503	3.60	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1174/1506	3.45	4.20	4.26	4.33	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	414/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	849/1490	3.74	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1129/1502	4.16	4.37	4.26	4.31	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	936/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	923/1006	3.11	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
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: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: DAVIS, PHIL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 76
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	9	4.75	269/1669	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1666	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	3.00	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	219/1617	3.75	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	939/1555	2.79	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	250/1543	3.53	3.85	4.06	4.10	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	862/1647	3.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.48	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	3.58	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	584/1514	3.81	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1551	4.74	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	191/1503	3.82	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	273/1506	3.90	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	264/1311	4.19	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	849/1490	3.81	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	846/1502	4.18	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	500/1489	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	3.92	4.06	4.00	3.99	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 213 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: VAN GORDER, NEI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 77
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	876/1669	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1001/1666	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	899/1617	3.75	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1555	2.79	3.73	4.00	3.96	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	5	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1543	3.53	3.85	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	962/1647	3.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.48	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	918/1605	3.58	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1136/1514	3.81	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.74	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	686/1503	3.82	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	575/1506	3.90	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.19	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1088/1490	3.81	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	4.18	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	865/1489	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	3.92	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BARBER, STEPHAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 78
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	2	2	4	3	3.31	1550/1669	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1516/1666	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.50	****/1421	3.00	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1301/1617	3.75	4.30	4.15	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	0	4	1	0	2.57	1516/1555	2.79	3.73	4.00	3.96	2.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1522/1543	3.53	3.85	4.06	4.10	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1393/1647	3.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	1370/1668	4.48	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1274/1605	3.58	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1136/1514	3.81	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.74	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1374/1503	3.82	4.22	4.24	4.29	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1225/1506	3.90	4.20	4.26	4.33	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	414/1311	4.19	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	808/1490	3.81	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	978/1502	4.18	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1038/1489	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	956/1006	3.92	4.06	4.00	3.99	2.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		Non-major 5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	10
?	0		

Course Section: ART 213 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BARBER, STEPHAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 79
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4	2	3	3.33	1542/1669	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	1	4	1	1	2.33	1648/1666	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.29	2.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.47	4.24	4.35	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	3	2	1	2.42	1598/1617	3.75	4.30	4.15	4.24	2.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	1	2	1	0	1.89	1550/1555	2.79	3.73	4.00	3.96	1.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	3	1	1	0	1.73	1633/1647	3.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	1.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1487/1668	4.48	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	6	2	0	0	2	2.00	1585/1605	3.58	4.13	4.07	4.15	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	3	2	0	2	2.25	1495/1514	3.81	4.26	4.39	4.39	2.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	1304/1551	4.74	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	3	2	1	2.67	1458/1503	3.82	4.22	4.24	4.29	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	2	2	1	2.42	1468/1506	3.90	4.20	4.26	4.33	2.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1104/1311	4.19	4.26	3.85	3.96	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1184/1490	3.81	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1013/1502	4.18	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	648/1489	4.39	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	3.92	4.06	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	8	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	11				
				? 0						

Course Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 80
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	951/1669	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	359/1666	4.57	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	717/1617	4.64	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	584/1555	4.22	3.73	4.00	3.96	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1543	4.50	3.85	4.06	4.10	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	977/1647	4.15	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.34	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	954/1551	4.79	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	686/1503	4.28	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	575/1506	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	189/1311	4.50	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	622/1490	4.06	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	818/1502	4.52	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	3.99	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 214 0201
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: PENNY, JOHN E
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 81
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1666	4.57	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.64	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1555	4.22	3.73	4.00	3.96	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	4.50	3.85	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.15	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1329/1668	4.34	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.79	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	719/1503	4.28	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	958/1506	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.50	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1490	4.06	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	754/1502	4.52	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 214 0301
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: PENNY, JOHN E
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 82
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	389/1669	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	494/1666	4.57	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.64	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	759/1647	4.15	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1470/1668	4.34	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	278/1605	4.43	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.79	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.28	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	884/1506	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	4.50	4.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	988/1490	4.06	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.52	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	20	36	21	3.88	1307/1669	3.88	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	7	19	25	29	3.88	1257/1666	3.88	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	71	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	1	5	12	21	23	3.97	1084/1617	3.97	4.30	4.15	4.24	3.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	2	4	14	22	25	3.96	856/1555	3.96	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	4	15	30	27	3.97	932/1543	3.97	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	10	17	15	36	3.95	1113/1647	3.95	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	71	9	4.10	1482/1668	4.10	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	15	36	16	3.97	970/1605	3.97	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	14	62	4.70	522/1514	4.70	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	11	70	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	23	53	4.57	500/1503	4.57	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	28	42	4.31	858/1506	4.31	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	13	65	4.79	126/1311	4.79	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	14	15	28	8	3.22	1278/1490	3.22	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	7	11	16	34	3.96	1065/1502	3.96	4.37	4.26	4.31	3.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	3	4	22	43	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	61	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	4	0	0	1	1	2.17	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	Graduate	0
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0		Major
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	Under-grad	82
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11		Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	21		
		A	48		
		B	24		
		C	0		
		D	0		
		F	0		
		P	0		
		I	0		
		?	0		
				Electives	0
				Other	69

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 113
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 84
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	0	2	11	22	37	4.31	852/1669	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	24	41	4.46	620/1666	4.46	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	17	53	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	10	30	29	4.28	780/1617	4.28	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	7	9	18	28	4.03	753/1555	4.03	3.73	4.00	3.96	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	4	13	22	23	3.89	1027/1543	3.89	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	4	6	18	43	4.41	651/1647	4.41	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	65	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	6	37	11	4.05	884/1605	4.05	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	10	58	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	66	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	23	40	4.46	637/1503	4.46	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	13	52	4.62	534/1506	4.62	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	6	9	55	4.70	174/1311	4.70	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	4	2	9	4	27	4.04	832/1490	4.04	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	3	11	12	21	4.09	982/1502	4.09	4.37	4.26	4.31	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	1	8	16	20	4.15	980/1489	4.15	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	28	4	0	5	7	3	3.26	869/1006	3.26	4.06	4.00	3.99	3.26	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	1	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	66	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	66	3	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	66	4	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	66	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	68	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	68	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	68	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	68	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 113
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 84
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	42	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	8	Under-grad	73	Non-major	53
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	2						

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	33	0	1	6	21	31	17	3.75	1371/1669	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	33	0	5	8	25	22	16	3.47	1479/1666	3.47	4.18	4.19	4.29	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	33	0	6	7	18	24	21	3.62	1185/1421	3.62	4.47	4.24	4.35	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	33	4	6	9	15	31	11	3.44	1403/1617	3.44	4.30	4.15	4.24	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	35	2	2	3	19	25	23	3.89	955/1555	3.89	3.73	4.00	3.96	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	35	1	7	5	23	27	11	3.41	1298/1543	3.41	3.85	4.06	4.10	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	36	0	3	9	20	25	16	3.58	1365/1647	3.58	3.97	4.12	4.19	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	35	0	0	1	1	72	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.62	4.67	4.59	4.96		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	44	2	1	1	24	32	5	3.62	1305/1605	3.62	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	0	4	9	23	37	4.27	1070/1514	4.27	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	4	9	61	4.77	843/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.72	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	3	3	12	30	25	3.97	1096/1503	3.97	4.22	4.24	4.29	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	4	13	18	39	4.24	917/1506	4.24	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	2	6	3	9	17	37	4.06	562/1311	4.06	4.26	3.85	3.96	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	25	6	8	9	14	2.69	1414/1490	2.69	4.17	4.05	4.11	2.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	21	10	19	10	2	2.39	1484/1502	2.39	4.37	4.26	4.31	2.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	17	12	15	10	8	2.68	1452/1489	2.68	4.49	4.29	4.36	2.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	46	52	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	95	11	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	100	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	100	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	99	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	96	7	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	95	5	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	97	5	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	96	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	96	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	99	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	98	0	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	97	5	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	7	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	7	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	96	7	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	96	8	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	97	9	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	97	9	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 114
 Questionnaires: 109

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 85
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 1 Major 5
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 37		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 12	General 11	Under-grad 108 Non-major 104
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 11	D 2		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 31	
			? 2		

Course Section: ART 275 0101
 Title INTRO TO PRINTMAKING
 Instructor: BOWLER, RUTH S
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 86
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1555	****	3.73	4.00	3.96	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.10	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	862/1647	4.25	3.97	4.12	4.19	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	170/1605	4.75	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	491/1503	4.57	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1084/1311	3.17	4.26	3.85	3.96	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 305 0101
 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 87
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1666	4.89	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1272/1555	3.44	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	659/1543	4.25	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.89	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	157/1605	4.78	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	4.78	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1311	4.89	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	669/1006	3.71	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 10 Non-major 7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	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: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 88
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1516/1669	3.43	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	0	3	1	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	3	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	807/1668	4.86	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1312/1605	3.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1295/1514	3.83	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.83	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1380/1503	3.33	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1361/1506	3.33	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	744/1311	3.83	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	988/1490	3.83	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 89
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	23	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	404/1669	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	483/1666	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	23	1	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	318/1421	4.72	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	24	6	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	370/1617	4.56	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	23	1	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	939/1555	4.20	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	22	3	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	490/1543	4.40	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	23	0	0	2	2	4	15	4.39	666/1647	4.47	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	1	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1164/1668	4.75	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	335/1605	4.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	257/1514	4.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1551	4.95	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	254/1503	4.80	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	212/1506	4.85	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	1	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	137/1311	4.79	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1049/1490	4.14	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	4	2	1	3	8	3.50	1301/1502	3.99	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	730/1489	4.61	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	12	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1006	4.60	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 89
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	46	Non-major	37
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course Section: ART 323 0102
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 90
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	12	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	360/1669	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	332/1666	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	1	0	1	3	23	4.71	331/1421	4.72	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.71		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	1	0	0	4	6	18	4.50	496/1617	4.56	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	5	20	4.48	359/1555	4.20	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	5	8	16	4.38	543/1543	4.40	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	424/1647	4.47	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	1	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	285/1668	4.75	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	268/1605	4.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	206/1514	4.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	539/1551	4.95	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	201/1503	4.80	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	261/1506	4.85	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	112/1311	4.79	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	8	15	4.54	422/1490	4.14	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	668/1502	3.99	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	434/1489	4.61	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	199/1006	4.60	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 41	Non-major 25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 0			

Course Section: ART 324 0101
 Title HISTORY OF FILM TO 196
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 91
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	0	2	1	7	15	7	3.75	1371/1669	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	5	12	8	7	3.53	1455/1666	3.53	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	8	10	14	4.19	871/1421	4.19	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.19		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	23	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1617	****	4.30	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	11	13	6	3.69	1118/1555	3.69	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	23	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	2	0	2	6	5	17	4.23	885/1647	4.23	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	1	0	0	16	15	4.38	1297/1668	4.38	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	6	18	3	3.89	1108/1605	3.89	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	663/1514	4.61	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	7	24	4.69	1000/1551	4.69	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	12	16	4.47	621/1503	4.47	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	4	8	16	4.16	980/1506	4.16	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	116/1311	4.81	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	7	4	2	2	3	2.44	1440/1490	2.44	4.17	4.05	4.11	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	8	2	5	0	3	2.33	1486/1502	2.33	4.37	4.26	4.28	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	4	1	6	4	3	3.06	1395/1489	3.06	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	14	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General 10	Under-grad 38 Non-major 25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		

Course Section: ART 326 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 92
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	13	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	1065/1666	4.06	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	878/1421	4.18	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	1	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	2	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	734/1555	4.07	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	747/1543	4.18	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	728/1647	4.35	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	769/1605	4.18	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.94	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	670/1503	4.44	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	585/1506	4.56	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	284/1311	4.47	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	965/1490	3.89	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	968/1502	4.11	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	753/1489	4.44	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 30 Non-major 29
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 responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: APOSTOLIDES, HE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 93
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	590/1669	3.94	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	319/1666	4.11	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	288/1617	4.23	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1555	4.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	481/1647	4.05	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1190/1668	4.60	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1132/1605	3.66	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	739/1514	4.14	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	510/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	3.91	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	995/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	372/1490	4.16	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	880/1502	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	657/1006	3.87	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.75	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 94
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	3	6	4.40	734/1669	3.94	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	814/1666	4.11	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	750/1617	4.23	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	992/1647	4.05	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1668	4.60	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	840/1605	3.66	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	715/1514	4.14	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	843/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1176/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1017/1506	3.91	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	800/1490	4.16	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	705/1502	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	865/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	292/1006	3.87	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.43	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	50/ 52	1.67	1.67	4.06	3.59	1.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	8
?	0		

Course Section: ART 331 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 95
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	2	2	5	2	2.93	1610/1669	3.94	4.26	4.23	4.28	2.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	2	5	3.33	1527/1666	4.11	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1284/1617	4.23	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1555	4.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1381/1647	4.05	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	1017/1668	4.60	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.66	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1424/1514	4.14	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1168/1551	4.77	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	6	0	4	3.15	1409/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	1	2	2.85	1427/1506	3.91	4.20	4.26	4.30	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	1027/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1036/1490	4.16	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	982/1502	4.26	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1116/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	799/1006	3.87	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 96
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1307/1669	3.81	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1334/1666	3.44	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	496/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1187/1647	3.79	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1464/1668	4.31	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1325/1605	3.71	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	1446/1514	3.25	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1338/1551	4.44	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	2	0	2.88	1439/1503	3.25	4.22	4.24	4.28	2.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	1353/1506	3.69	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	875/1311	3.74	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1490	3.92	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	818/1502	4.58	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	684/1489	4.58	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 332 0102
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 97
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	1	2	3	3.75	1371/1669	3.81	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1565/1666	3.44	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1425/1617	3.95	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1295/1647	3.79	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1190/1668	4.31	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1132/1605	3.71	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	0	3	3.38	1412/1514	3.25	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1083/1551	4.44	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1293/1503	3.25	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1069/1506	3.69	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	731/1311	3.74	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	988/1490	3.92	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.58	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	532/1489	4.58	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 333 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 98
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	647/1669	4.58	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	908/1666	4.37	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	670/1421	4.55	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	801/1617	4.47	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1111/1555	3.85	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1543	3.80	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1137/1647	4.08	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1492/1668	4.08	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	6	1	3.54	1343/1605	3.87	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	955/1514	4.51	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1361/1551	4.41	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	719/1503	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1025/1506	4.28	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	4.17	4.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	849/1490	4.18	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1253/1502	4.06	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1137/1489	4.16	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	3.75	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	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	11
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 333 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 99
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	9	4.69	345/1669	4.58	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1666	4.37	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	356/1421	4.55	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	288/1617	4.47	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	773/1555	3.85	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	3.85	4.06	4.14	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	885/1647	4.08	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1492/1668	4.08	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	759/1605	3.87	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	663/1514	4.51	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1097/1551	4.41	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	621/1503	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	693/1506	4.28	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	501/1311	4.17	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	594/1490	4.18	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	693/1502	4.06	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	742/1489	4.16	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	657/1006	3.75	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
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: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 100
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1131/1669	4.03	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	881/1666	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	934/1617	4.07	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1555	2.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1012/1647	4.20	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1068/1668	4.55	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	918/1605	3.90	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1003/1514	4.10	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	788/1551	4.76	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1030/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	1042/1506	3.96	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	445/1311	4.25	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	709/1490	4.33	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	632/1502	4.54	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	613/1489	4.36	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1006	3.25	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 2		

Course Section: ART 334 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: LENZER, JANET
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 101
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1173/1669	4.03	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1001/1666	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1029/1617	4.07	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1545/1555	2.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	759/1647	4.20	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.55	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1172/1605	3.90	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1295/1514	4.10	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.76	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1277/1503	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1199/1506	3.96	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	4.33	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502	4.54	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	986/1489	4.36	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	873/1006	3.25	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 335 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V
 Instructor: KIRSTEL, HARVEY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 102
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1332/1669	3.83	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1065/1666	4.06	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	10	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	710/1421	4.38	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	1179/1617	3.88	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	889/1555	3.94	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	659/1543	4.25	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	324/1647	4.65	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	4	9	2	3.87	1124/1605	3.87	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	522/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1127/1551	4.59	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	819/1506	4.35	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	108/1311	4.82	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	3	2	2	4	2.93	1366/1490	2.93	4.17	4.05	4.11	2.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	1287/1502	3.56	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1191/1489	3.75	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	2	0	3	0	3	3.25	873/1006	3.25	4.06	4.00	4.10	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 341 0101
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: DELANEY, RICK
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 103
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1103/1669	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1094/1666	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.63	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	773/1555	3.57	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1440/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	4.61	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1210/1605	3.59	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1172/1514	3.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1443/1551	3.95	4.74	4.66	4.70	3.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1168/1503	3.67	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1300/1506	3.47	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	174/1311	4.52	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1490	4.19	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	4.69	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	827/1489	4.31	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: DELANEY, RICK
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 104
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	951/1669	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1250/1666	3.94	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	4.63	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	1401/1555	3.57	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1421/1647	3.42	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1400/1668	4.61	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1391/1605	3.59	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1352/1514	3.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1404/1551	3.95	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1351/1503	3.67	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1361/1506	3.47	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	389/1311	4.52	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1036/1490	4.19	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	781/1502	4.69	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	920/1489	4.31	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 342 0101
 Title FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 105
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	8	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	414/1617	4.58	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	100/1555	4.91	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	552/1543	4.36	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	566/1647	4.45	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	278/1605	4.63	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	425/1503	4.64	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	228/1311	4.58	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	271/1006	4.45	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 345 0101
 Title FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 106
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	580/1543	4.33	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	4.67	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.33	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 346 0101
 Title VIDEO II
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 107
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1133/1555	3.67	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	575/1506	4.57	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	189/1311	4.67	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	162/1490	4.88	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	407/1006	4.20	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.20	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	114/1617	4.90	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1555	4.17	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1311	4.88	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 109
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1100/1421	3.83	4.47	4.24	4.25	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1395/1555	3.17	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1456/1543	2.92	3.85	4.06	4.14	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1265/1668	4.42	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1092/1605	3.91	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	1338/1551	4.25	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	909/1506	4.25	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	699/1311	3.91	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	749/1490	4.18	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	866/1502	4.27	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.00	

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	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 353 0101
 Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 110
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	6	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1106/1668	4.63	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	90/1311	4.88	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 356 0101
 Title ALTERNATIVE PROCESSES
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 111
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.86	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	828/1647	4.29	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	173/1503	4.86	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	307/1006	4.40	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.40	

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 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 4
84-150	5	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 6	
			? 1		

Course Section: ART 359 0101
 Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 112
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	137/1617	4.86	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	665/1555	4.14	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	700/1543	4.21	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	728/1647	4.36	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.91	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	210/1503	4.82	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	509/1506	4.64	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	158/1311	4.73	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	316/1490	4.70	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	5.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ART 359 0101
 Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 112
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course Section: ART 360 0101
 Title MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 113
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	750/1617	4.30	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	0	4	3.30	1336/1555	3.30	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1466/1543	2.89	3.85	4.06	4.14	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	926/1647	4.20	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1353/1668	4.30	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	840/1605	4.11	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	537/1514	4.70	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	433/1506	4.70	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	264/1311	4.50	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1489	4.89	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	4.06	4.00	4.10	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 114
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1353/1666	3.71	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1617	****	4.30	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1620/1668	3.71	4.62	4.67	4.68	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1549/1605	2.67	4.13	4.07	4.09	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1337/1514	3.71	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1326/1551	4.29	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1309/1503	3.57	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1258/1506	3.71	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	731/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1202/1490	3.43	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	986/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
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	1
			? 1		

Course Section: ART 384 0101
 Title: COMPUTER ANIMATION
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, FRANK
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 115
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1669	4.79	4.26	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	206/1666	4.61	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	347/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	988/1555	3.51	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1006/1543	4.13	3.85	4.06	4.14	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	2	4	4	3.69	1305/1647	4.01	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	99/1605	4.70	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	151/1514	4.86	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	277/1503	4.38	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	131/1506	4.71	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	63/1311	4.71	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1490	4.76	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.94	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	532/1489	4.71	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	5.00	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	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	13
			? 1		

Course Section: ART 384 0201
 Title COMPUTER ANIMATION
 Instructor: MCINTYRE, FRANK
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 116
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	4.79	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	662/1666	4.61	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1617	4.75	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1395/1555	3.51	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	580/1543	4.13	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	759/1647	4.01	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1605	4.70	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1514	4.86	4.26	4.39	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.38	4.22	4.24	4.28	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.71	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	264/1311	4.71	4.26	3.85	3.97	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.76	4.17	4.05	4.11	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	4.94	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.71	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		11
			I 0		Non-major
			? 0		5
					7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 388 0101
 Title ART ON THE INTERNET
 Instructor: HOWELL, BRENDAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 117
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	996/1555	3.83	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	298/1543	4.60	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1490	****	4.17	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	1376/1502	3.20	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.49	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 389 0101
 Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART
 Instructor: STROUD, DAVID
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 118
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	1596/1669	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	0	2	2.75	1615/1666	2.75	4.18	4.19	4.20	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1467/1617	3.27	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1555	****	3.73	4.00	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.85	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	2	0	0	2	2.43	1595/1647	2.43	3.97	4.12	4.14	2.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1164/1668	4.55	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	1	2	4	0	2.70	1545/1605	2.70	4.13	4.07	4.09	2.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1324/1514	3.75	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1384/1551	4.13	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1293/1503	3.63	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1395/1506	3.13	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	718/1311	3.88	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1117/1490	3.60	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.37	4.26	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.40	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

Course Section: ART 389B 0101
 Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 119
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	4	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1303/1555	3.40	3.73	4.00	4.03	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1605	4.86	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	547/1506	4.60	4.20	4.26	4.30	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.10	5.00	

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 0		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 2		

Course Section: ART 392 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: SALTZMAN, RICK
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 120
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1077/1669	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1094/1666	3.88	4.18	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	6	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1494/1617	3.34	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	773/1555	3.40	3.73	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1543	1.50	3.85	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	1603/1647	2.68	3.97	4.12	4.14	2.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.63	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.27	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1324/1514	3.65	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1254/1551	4.67	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1358/1503	3.46	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	1371/1506	3.51	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1048/1311	3.46	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1447/1490	2.83	4.17	4.05	4.11	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1484/1502	2.95	4.37	4.26	4.28	2.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1472/1489	3.01	4.49	4.29	4.35	2.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.10	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 392 0201
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: SALTZMAN, RICK
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 121
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	8	4.31	852/1669	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	1	7	3.77	1329/1666	3.88	4.18	4.19	4.20	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	0	1	7	3.54	1360/1617	3.34	4.30	4.15	4.22	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	4	2	1	2.80	1482/1555	3.40	3.73	4.00	4.03	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1541/1543	1.50	3.85	4.06	4.14	1.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	6	1	2	3.08	1522/1647	2.68	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1289/1668	4.63	4.62	4.67	4.68	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	1339/1605	3.27	4.13	4.07	4.09	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1381/1514	3.65	4.26	4.39	4.46	3.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.67	4.74	4.66	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1330/1503	3.46	4.22	4.24	4.28	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1254/1506	3.51	4.20	4.26	4.30	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	868/1311	3.46	4.26	3.85	3.97	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1265/1490	2.83	4.17	4.05	4.11	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1301/1502	2.95	4.37	4.26	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1232/1489	3.01	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 423 0101
 Title ART SINCE 1945
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 122
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	10	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	1028/1666	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	594/1421	4.47	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	3	7	3.76	1054/1555	3.76	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	857/1543	4.06	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	532/1647	4.47	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	423/1605	4.47	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	1003/1514	4.35	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	307/1551	4.94	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	1040/1503	4.06	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	3	10	4.06	1047/1506	4.06	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	137/1311	4.76	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	324/1490	4.69	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	576/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	309/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	465/1006	4.07	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.07	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 425 0101
 Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 123
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	876/1669	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	922/1617	4.14	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	195/1555	4.71	3.73	4.00	4.08	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1647	****	3.97	4.12	4.14	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1605	4.86	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 430 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 124
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	4	14	4.45	676/1669	4.45	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	372/1666	4.65	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	253/1617	4.72	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	3	3	1	0	4	2.91	1470/1555	2.91	3.73	4.00	4.08	2.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	628/1543	4.29	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	984/1647	4.11	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1157/1668	4.55	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	220/1605	4.69	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	1064/1514	4.29	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	0	11	4.43	686/1503	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	0	11	4.43	744/1506	4.43	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	426/1311	4.29	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1502	4.87	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	456/1489	4.73	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	447/1006	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 1	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 18	
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 125
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	2	4	5	4.27	889/1669	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1543	****	3.85	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	4	2	1	2	3.11	1519/1647	3.11	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1370/1668	4.27	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1195/1605	3.78	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1083/1551	4.63	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.13	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	712/1311	3.89	4.26	3.85	3.88	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	718/1490	4.22	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	586/1502	4.56	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	753/1489	4.44	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 435A 0101
 Title REPRESENTATION
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 126
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1543	4.40	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1250/1647	3.80	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	690/1605	4.25	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	378/1489	4.80	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 447 0101
 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI
 Instructor: DELANEY, RICK
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 127
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	781/1669	4.49	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	881/1666	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	780/1617	4.49	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	438/1555	4.03	3.73	4.00	4.08	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	1	4	3.73	1290/1647	3.86	3.97	4.12	4.14	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1096/1668	4.38	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1195/1605	3.82	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	584/1514	4.48	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1028/1551	4.83	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	510/1503	4.56	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.46	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	86/1311	4.87	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	754/1502	4.37	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 447 0201
 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI
 Instructor: MALDONADO, JORG
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 128
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1669	4.49	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	727/1666	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.60	4.47	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.49	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1133/1555	4.03	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1043/1647	3.86	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1464/1668	4.38	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1132/1605	3.82	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1064/1514	4.48	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.83	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	491/1503	4.56	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	995/1506	4.46	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.87	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.37	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.37	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 456 0101
 Title PHOTO SENIOR THESIS I
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 129
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1001/1666	4.14	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.47	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	801/1617	4.25	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1287/1555	3.43	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1386/1543	3.13	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	697/1647	4.38	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.88	4.62	4.67	4.70	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	4.13	4.07	4.16	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1160/1514	4.13	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1135/1551	4.57	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1353/1506	3.38	4.20	4.26	4.29	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	731/1311	3.86	4.26	3.85	3.88	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	4.43	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	438/1502	4.71	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	810/1006	3.40	4.06	4.00	4.21	3.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	3.94	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course Section: ART 480 0101
 Title HIST/THEORY IMAGING
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 130
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	0	6	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555	4.57	3.73	4.00	4.08	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	628/1543	4.29	3.85	4.06	4.18	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	481/1647	4.50	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1605	4.86	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	445/1311	4.25	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	344/1006	4.33	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.63	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.88	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.75	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 484 0101
 Title ADVANCED 3D ANIMATION
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 131
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	243/1666	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.71	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1311	4.86	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.83	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: ART 488 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS: COMPUTER A
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 132
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1669/1669	1.33	4.26	4.23	4.39	1.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	2.33	4.18	4.19	4.22	2.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1610/1617	2.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	3.73	4.00	4.08	2.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1571/1647	2.67	3.97	4.12	4.14	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1627/1668	3.67	4.62	4.67	4.70	3.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1585/1605	2.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1514/1514	1.50	4.26	4.39	4.45	1.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1477/1551	3.67	4.74	4.66	4.73	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1501/1503	2.25	4.22	4.24	4.27	2.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1502/1506	1.67	4.20	4.26	4.29	1.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1285/1311	1.67	4.26	3.85	3.88	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.37	4.26	4.46	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course Section: ART 488 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS: COMPUTER A
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 133
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1669/1669	1.33	4.26	4.23	4.39	1.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	2.33	4.18	4.19	4.22	2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1610/1617	2.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	3.73	4.00	4.08	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1571/1647	2.67	3.97	4.12	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1627/1668	3.67	4.62	4.67	4.70	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1501/1514	1.50	4.26	4.39	4.45	1.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1423/1503	2.25	4.22	4.24	4.27	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	4.17	4.05	4.26	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1475/1502	2.50	4.37	4.26	4.46	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 489 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECTS
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 134
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	4	5	4.18	1001/1669	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.47	4.24	4.38	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	780/1617	4.27	4.30	4.15	4.22	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	939/1555	3.90	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1043/1543	3.88	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	926/1647	4.20	3.97	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.26	4.39	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.74	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	174/1311	4.70	4.26	3.85	3.88	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	622/1490	4.33	4.17	4.05	4.26	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	322/1006	4.38	4.06	4.00	4.21	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	2.50	4.22	3.94	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 491 0120
 Title SPECIAL STUDIES
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 135
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 494 0139
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 136
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.39	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.75	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 494 0141
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 137
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	373/1605	4.75	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	1.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	58/ 58	1.00	2.50	4.22	3.94	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 495 0143
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 138
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						

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

Course Section: ART 495 0145
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 139
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.73	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	3.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 495 0146
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 140
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1173/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 495 0146
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 141
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1173/1669	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	3.00	3.85	4.06	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.70	5.00	

Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	3.00	4.26	3.85	3.88	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ART 610 0101
 Title IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 142
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	1	3.00	1596/1669	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1553/1555	1.50	3.73	4.00	4.07	1.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1636/1647	1.50	3.97	4.12	4.15	1.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1274/1605	3.67	4.13	4.07	4.13	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1352/1514	3.67	4.26	4.39	4.37	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.24	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	4.67	4.26	3.85	3.89	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.17	4.05	4.18	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	94/ 112	3.50	4.63	4.38	4.39	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	50/ 97	4.50	4.88	4.36	4.38	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.75	4.20	4.23	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	97/ 98	1.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 58	4.00	2.50	4.22	4.53	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 143
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1645/1647	1.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.62	4.67	4.83	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.49	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.88	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.75	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 690 0125
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 144
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: Art 690 0126
 Title Ind. Studies
 Instructor: Worden, Fred
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	389/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	****	4.53	4.38	4.04	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	****	4.23	4.36	4.19	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	****	3.93	4.22	3.79	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	****	4.17	4.20	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 690 0140
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 145
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00

7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00

Self Paced

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.45	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.60	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 720A 0101
 Title WRTNG BY & ABOUT ARTIS
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 146
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	8	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1617	4.83	4.30	4.15	4.24	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1647	4.83	3.97	4.12	4.15	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	483/1311	4.20	4.26	3.85	3.89	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.17	4.05	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.37	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.88	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.75	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	5.00	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	7

Course Section: ART 740 0101
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 147
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.63	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.88	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.75	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.00	3.95	3.93	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ART 790 0139
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 148
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.47	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.30	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.73	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.85	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.97	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.62	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.26	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.20	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.26	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.17	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.37	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.45	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.40	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.60	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	5.00	4.34	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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