

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	11	5.00	1/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	173/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1615	4.70	4.42	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1010/1566	3.58	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1528	3.13	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	879/1650	3.75	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	3.97	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1559	4.47	4.48	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.75	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	294/1549	4.48	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	231/1546	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	481/1323	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	690/1384	4.06	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	970/1378	4.39	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	4.39	4.50	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	4.17	4.24	4.03	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	****	****

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 5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 6
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 9		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	632/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	259/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	123/1615	4.70	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1246/1566	3.58	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1011/1528	3.13	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	429/1650	3.75	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	637/1626	3.97	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	435/1559	4.47	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	417/1560	4.75	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	238/1549	4.48	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	520/1546	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	156/1323	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	348/1384	4.06	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	431/1378	4.39	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	702/1378	4.39	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	594/ 904	4.17	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.83
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1344/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	3	2	3.20	1582/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	1	6	4.00	1083/1615	4.70	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1285/1566	3.58	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	4	1	0	2.33	1512/1528	3.13	3.88	4.12	4.11	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	2	3	0	0	2.14	1636/1650	3.75	4.04	4.22	4.20	2.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1082/1667	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	0	1	5	0	2.89	1563/1626	3.97	4.26	4.11	4.06	2.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	1421/1559	4.47	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1398/1560	4.75	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1389/1549	4.48	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	3	3	3.30	1432/1546	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.30	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	641/1323	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	2	3	3.38	1154/1384	4.06	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	923/1378	4.39	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	0	2	3	3.38	1240/1378	4.39	4.50	4.31	4.26	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	4.17	4.24	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 210 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 91
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	611/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	870/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	210/1615	4.70	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1373/1566	3.58	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1528	3.13	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1135/1650	3.75	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	7	1	3.78	1240/1626	3.97	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1052/1559	4.47	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.75	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	366/1549	4.48	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	407/1546	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	183/1323	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	820/1384	4.06	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.39	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	481/1378	4.39	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	4.17	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
84-150	0	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	8				
				? 1						

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	6	7	4.54	632/1670	4.68	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	224/1666	4.74	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1406	4.60	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	281/1615	4.69	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	851/1566	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1025/1528	3.77	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	630/1650	4.48	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	483/1626	4.40	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	503/1559	4.80	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	751/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.77	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	582/1546	4.63	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	107/1323	4.65	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	278/1384	4.54	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	571/1378	4.73	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	605/ 904	4.05	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 92
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 93
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	144/1670	4.68	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	250/1666	4.74	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	340/1406	4.60	4.54	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	238/1615	4.69	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	851/1566	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1113/1528	3.77	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	406/1650	4.48	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	861/1667	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	531/1626	4.40	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	323/1559	4.80	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	238/1549	4.77	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	333/1546	4.63	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	223/1323	4.65	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	364/1384	4.54	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	4.73	4.46	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	225/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	425/ 904	4.05	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	11				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 94
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	589/1670	4.68	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	529/1666	4.74	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	644/1406	4.60	4.54	4.32	4.39	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	552/1615	4.69	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	808/1566	4.02	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1245/1528	3.77	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	782/1650	4.48	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1104/1667	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	670/1626	4.40	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	503/1559	4.80	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	929/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	586/1549	4.77	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	768/1546	4.63	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	481/1323	4.65	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	657/1384	4.54	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	503/1378	4.73	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	560/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	405/ 904	4.05	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.20

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	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	13				
				? 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	1	4	8	4.36	876/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	622/1666	4.66	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	477/1615	4.81	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1122/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1328/1528	4.16	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	1032/1650	4.24	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	885/1667	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	605/1626	4.51	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.76	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	725/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	323/1549	4.71	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	715/1546	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	167/1323	4.70	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	638/1384	4.57	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	603/1378	4.77	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	425/ 904	4.08	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	964/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	931/1666	4.66	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	281/1615	4.81	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1444/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1528	4.16	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	5	5	3.79	1341/1650	4.24	4.04	4.22	4.20	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1104/1667	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1124/1626	4.51	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	809/1559	4.76	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1023/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	876/1549	4.71	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1252/1546	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.30	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	326/1323	4.70	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	920/1384	4.57	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	797/1378	4.77	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	602/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	328/ 904	4.08	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ART 212 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 96
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 97
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	173/1666	4.66	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	176/1615	4.81	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	389/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.16	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	720/1650	4.24	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1667	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	141/1626	4.51	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	435/1559	4.76	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1549	4.71	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	482/1546	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	172/1323	4.70	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1384	4.57	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.77	4.46	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	629/ 904	4.08	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	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		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 2		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 98
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	173/1666	4.66	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	176/1615	4.81	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	389/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.16	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	720/1650	4.24	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1667	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	4.51	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	4.76	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	4.71	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	4.70	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1384	4.57	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.77	4.46	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	629/ 904	4.08	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 99
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	621/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.66	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	363/1406	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.39	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	176/1615	4.81	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	354/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1122/1528	4.16	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	645/1650	4.24	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.51	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.76	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.83	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	337/1549	4.71	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	520/1546	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	183/1323	4.70	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1384	4.57	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	4.77	4.46	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.85	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	279/ 904	4.08	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 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	0	1	3	8	4.58	578/1670	4.34	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	870/1666	4.24	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.39	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1039/1615	4.28	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.45	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1274/1528	3.42	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	985/1650	3.78	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	922/1667	4.86	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1124/1626	3.86	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1092/1559	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	1090/1560	4.70	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	749/1549	4.23	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	835/1546	4.29	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	144/1323	4.67	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	796/1384	4.15	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	831/1378	4.41	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	977/1378	4.37	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	698/ 904	4.03	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 0
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	1			

Course-Section: ART 213 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 101
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	589/1670	4.34	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	622/1666	4.24	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	477/1615	4.28	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1419/1566	3.45	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1368/1528	3.42	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	782/1650	3.78	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	885/1667	4.86	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	403/1626	3.86	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.70	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	683/1549	4.23	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	545/1546	4.29	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1323	4.67	4.50	4.00	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	589/1384	4.15	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	441/1378	4.41	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	481/1378	4.37	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	425/ 904	4.03	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.14

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 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	14	
				? 2			

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 102
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	737/1670	4.34	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	703/1666	4.24	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	346/1615	4.28	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1144/1566	3.45	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1528	3.42	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	5	1	3.40	1503/1650	3.78	4.04	4.22	4.20	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.86	4.75	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1254/1626	3.86	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1022/1559	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	855/1560	4.70	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	816/1549	4.23	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	849/1546	4.29	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	299/1323	4.67	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	570/1384	4.15	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	510/1378	4.41	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	4.37	4.50	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	4.03	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****

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 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 213 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 103
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1442/1670	4.34	4.47	4.31	4.32	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1452/1666	4.24	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1325/1615	4.28	4.42	4.24	4.29	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1373/1566	3.45	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1528	3.42	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1559/1650	3.78	4.04	4.22	4.20	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.86	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1483/1626	3.86	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1396/1559	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1326/1560	4.70	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1377/1549	4.23	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1313/1546	4.29	4.39	4.32	4.30	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	507/1323	4.67	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	996/1384	4.15	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	970/1378	4.41	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1110/1378	4.37	4.50	4.31	4.26	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	587/ 904	4.03	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 0
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	1			

Course-Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 104
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	794/1670	4.56	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	379/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1447/1566	3.14	4.07	4.07	4.00	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	5	1	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	806/1650	3.69	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1157/1667	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	797/1626	4.32	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1559	4.66	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	789/1549	4.48	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	822/1546	4.48	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	842/1323	4.25	4.50	4.00	4.08	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	3.86	4.20	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	400/1378	4.28	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	777/1378	4.24	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 214 0201
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: PENNY, JOHN E
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 105
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1003/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	687/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1511/1650	3.69	4.04	4.22	4.20	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	712/1667	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	4.32	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	772/1559	4.66	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	900/1549	4.48	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	919/1546	4.48	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	4.25	4.50	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	996/1384	3.86	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	860/1378	4.28	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	653/1378	4.24	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****

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	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	5				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 214 0301
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 106
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	414/1670	4.56	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	931/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	660/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	3.14	4.07	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	3.00	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1511/1650	3.69	4.04	4.22	4.20	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	540/1667	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	605/1626	4.32	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	673/1559	4.66	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.83	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	488/1549	4.48	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	520/1546	4.48	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	260/1323	4.25	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1171/1384	3.86	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1081/1378	4.28	4.46	4.29	4.25	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1076/1378	4.24	4.50	4.31	4.26	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 120
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 107
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	9	20	35	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	16	47	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	13	51	4.74	329/1406	4.74	4.54	4.32	4.39	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	10	17	31	4.21	922/1615	4.21	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	9	14	40	4.45	440/1566	4.45	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	13	28	20	3.92	1011/1528	3.92	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	4	19	38	4.46	630/1650	4.46	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	4	4	59	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	7	32	12	4.10	905/1626	4.10	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	16	47	4.72	589/1559	4.72	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	58	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	11	50	4.76	352/1549	4.76	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	12	47	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	5	12	41	4.58	288/1323	4.58	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	3	8	7	17	3.92	920/1384	3.92	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	3	4	9	21	4.21	884/1378	4.21	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	2	4	10	21	4.35	795/1378	4.35	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	27	28	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	64	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	64	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 120
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 107
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	35	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	B	24						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	66	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 115
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 108
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	8	18	37	4.31	929/1670	4.31	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	15	24	23	3.93	1294/1666	3.93	4.37	4.27	4.27	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	12	16	32	4.06	1027/1406	4.06	4.54	4.32	4.39	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	3	10	21	26	4.17	972/1615	4.17	4.42	4.24	4.29	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	15	42	4.53	374/1566	4.53	4.07	4.07	4.00	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	4	14	21	17	3.81	1113/1528	3.81	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	6	20	34	4.18	985/1650	4.18	4.04	4.22	4.20	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	65	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	0	8	30	10	3.98	1004/1626	3.98	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	12	49	4.66	673/1559	4.66	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	59	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.83	4.72	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	10	21	33	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	7	13	44	4.52	691/1546	4.52	4.39	4.32	4.30	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	14	46	4.74	194/1323	4.74	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	13	4	8	8	13	3.09	1256/1384	3.09	4.20	4.10	4.07	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	8	9	7	16	3.47	1207/1378	3.47	4.46	4.29	4.25	3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	4	4	12	10	14	3.59	1167/1378	3.59	4.50	4.31	4.26	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	22	36	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	4	0	0	0	3	2.71	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	2	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	61	0	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	61	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 115
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 108
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	31						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	7	Under-grad	67	Non-major	42
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	12	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 305 0101
 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 109
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	185/1670	4.92	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1407/1528	3.22	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	705/1650	4.42	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	255/1626	4.70	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.70	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	183/1323	4.75	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.75	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	487/1384	4.45	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	763/1378	4.36	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	702/1378	4.45	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.24	4.03	4.03	4.00	

Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****	

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	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	4	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		6				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 314 0101
 Title DRAWING II
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 110
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	0	4	1	2.73	1646/1670	2.73	4.47	4.31	4.24	2.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	1	1	2.60	1641/1666	2.60	4.37	4.27	4.18	2.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1250/1406	3.60	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1519/1615	3.30	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1566	****	4.07	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	1	2	0	0	1.50	1525/1528	1.50	3.88	4.12	4.07	1.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	2	0	2	2.36	1629/1650	2.36	4.04	4.22	4.12	2.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1052/1667	4.64	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	3	1	0	2.33	1605/1626	2.33	4.26	4.11	4.06	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	1542/1559	2.50	4.48	4.46	4.40	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1524/1560	3.50	4.83	4.72	4.67	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	0	1	1	2.67	1518/1549	2.67	4.44	4.31	4.25	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	0	1	0	1.83	1539/1546	1.83	4.39	4.32	4.24	1.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1284/1323	2.33	4.50	4.00	3.99	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.50	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 111
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1511/1670	3.60	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1479/1666	3.60	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1250/1406	3.60	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1230/1566	3.60	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1494/1528	2.75	3.88	4.12	4.07	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1330/1650	3.80	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.50	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1396/1559	3.80	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1163/1560	4.60	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1273/1546	3.80	4.39	4.32	4.24	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	423/1323	4.40	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	860/1378	4.25	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.00

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	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 321 0101
 Title 19TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 112
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	11	15	4.29	953/1670	4.29	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	8	9	12	3.94	1282/1666	3.94	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	8	4	13	3.74	1210/1406	3.74	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	14	10	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	8	16	4.17	734/1566	4.17	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	5	12	8	3.89	1047/1528	3.89	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	6	6	13	3.80	1330/1650	3.80	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	6	13	4	3.79	1226/1626	3.79	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	6	20	4.48	921/1559	4.48	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	11	13	4.10	1108/1549	4.10	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	21	4.52	703/1546	4.52	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	4	5	19	4.45	384/1323	4.45	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	3	6	2	6	3.14	1239/1384	3.14	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	2	7	3	7	3.52	1185/1378	3.52	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	11	1	7	3.62	1162/1378	3.62	4.50	4.31	4.33	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	10	20	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General		8	Under-grad	31	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		16				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 113
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	13	17	4.39	822/1670	4.45	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	12	13	4.06	1161/1666	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	15	4.24	884/1406	4.49	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	17	7	4.07	1044/1615	4.24	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	9	16	4.22	686/1566	4.35	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	4	14	10	4.14	814/1528	4.15	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	11	16	4.21	950/1650	4.40	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	270/1667	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	7	13	6	3.96	1021/1626	4.17	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	821/1559	4.69	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1560	4.98	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	15	11	4.28	960/1549	4.49	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	445/1546	4.71	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	266/1323	4.75	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	4	9	2	4	3.10	1255/1384	3.65	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	3	10	2	3	3.05	1295/1378	3.88	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	2	8	4	5	3.50	1189/1378	4.11	4.50	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	14	16	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General		2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		27				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ART 323 0201
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: FAGAN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 114
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	665/1670	4.45	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	477/1666	4.34	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	329/1406	4.49	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	673/1615	4.24	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	409/1566	4.35	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	4	5	14	4.16	787/1528	4.15	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	443/1650	4.40	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	1104/1667	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	584/1626	4.17	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	419/1559	4.69	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	239/1560	4.98	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	439/1549	4.49	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	470/1546	4.71	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	126/1323	4.75	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	696/1384	3.65	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	441/1378	3.88	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	481/1378	4.11	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	14	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 5	Under-grad 28	Non-major 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	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 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 325 0101
 Title HIST OF FILM & VIDEO
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 115
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	18	13	4.14	1128/1670	4.14	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	12	12	11	3.84	1363/1666	3.84	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	9	17	4.11	997/1406	4.11	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	25	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1234/1615	3.91	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	8	9	17	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	8	20	4.24	914/1650	4.24	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	4.70	983/1667	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	15	9	4.22	762/1626	4.22	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.22

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	623/1559	4.69	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	34	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	11	21	4.51	670/1549	4.51	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	11	21	4.47	755/1546	4.47	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	48/1323	4.97	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.97

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	6	1	3	2	5	2.94	1283/1384	2.94	4.20	4.10	4.12	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	5	2	1	3	5	3.06	1294/1378	3.06	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.50	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	21	11	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	11	Under-grad	37	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 327 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 116
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	7	10	3.81	1414/1670	3.81	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1487/1666	3.58	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	3	5	8	6	3.44	1294/1406	3.44	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	4	8	8	3.95	1158/1615	3.95	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	6	7	8	3.68	1190/1566	3.68	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	6	10	3.88	1055/1528	3.88	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	2	5	6	8	3.58	1436/1650	3.58	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	12	8	4.18	808/1626	3.91	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	555/1559	4.64	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1560	4.85	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	683/1549	4.35	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	582/1546	4.52	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	141/1323	4.71	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	1	7	2	2	2.81	1307/1384	2.81	4.20	4.10	4.12	2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	2	6	2	3	3.00	1297/1378	3.00	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	4	5	3	3.31	1262/1378	3.31	4.50	4.31	4.33	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	12
			? 2		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 327 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 117
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	7	10	3.81	1414/1670	3.81	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1487/1666	3.58	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	3	5	8	6	3.44	1294/1406	3.44	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	4	8	8	3.95	1158/1615	3.95	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	6	7	8	3.68	1190/1566	3.68	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	6	10	3.88	1055/1528	3.88	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	2	5	6	8	3.58	1436/1650	3.58	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	5	10	1	3.65	1323/1626	3.91	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	834/1559	4.64	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	1054/1560	4.85	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	1027/1549	4.35	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	822/1546	4.52	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	288/1323	4.71	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	1	7	2	2	2.81	1307/1384	2.81	4.20	4.10	4.12	2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	2	6	2	3	3.00	1297/1378	3.00	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	4	5	3	3.31	1262/1378	3.31	4.50	4.31	4.33	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 26 Non-major 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	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 12	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 118
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	3	3	3.38	1571/1670	2.96	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	2	3.38	1549/1666	3.12	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1203/1615	3.38	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1335/1566	3.43	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1447/1528	2.82	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	1	2	3.00	1580/1650	2.79	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	8	1	3.77	1631/1667	3.88	4.75	4.67	4.67	3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	7	0	3.40	1438/1626	3.20	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1492/1559	2.90	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1326/1560	4.14	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1365/1549	3.13	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1411/1546	2.92	4.39	4.32	4.24	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	941/1323	3.14	4.50	4.00	3.99	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	962/1384	3.10	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1048/1378	3.58	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	956/1378	3.60	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	752/ 904	3.43	4.24	4.03	4.03	3.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 13	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 119
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	6	2	0	2.54	1653/1670	2.96	4.47	4.31	4.24	2.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	5	0	2.85	1632/1666	3.12	4.37	4.27	4.18	2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	5	0	2.85	1592/1615	3.38	4.42	4.24	4.18	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1566	3.43	4.07	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	4	1	1	2.64	1503/1528	2.82	3.88	4.12	4.07	2.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	1	6	2	0	2.58	1620/1650	2.79	4.04	4.22	4.12	2.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	1	4.00	1524/1667	3.88	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1534/1626	3.20	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	3	2	0	2.50	1542/1559	2.90	4.48	4.46	4.40	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	1494/1560	4.14	4.83	4.72	4.67	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1518/1549	3.13	4.44	4.31	4.25	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	4	1	0	2.44	1526/1546	2.92	4.39	4.32	4.24	2.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1265/1323	3.14	4.50	4.00	3.99	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1350/1384	3.10	4.20	4.10	4.12	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1265/1378	3.58	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	1	4	0	3.13	1298/1378	3.60	4.50	4.31	4.33	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	3.43	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

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 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	765/1670	4.55	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	465/1666	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	837/1615	4.14	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	491/1566	4.31	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	0	4	7	4.07	1095/1650	3.92	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	616/1626	4.68	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1092/1559	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1090/1560	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	900/1549	4.50	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	768/1546	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	141/1323	4.62	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	932/1384	4.05	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	970/1378	4.10	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	786/1378	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	648/ 904	3.71	4.24	4.03	4.03	3.71
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		14				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 332 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 121
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	479/1670	4.55	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	870/1666	4.48	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	4.67	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.14	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	675/1566	4.31	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1347/1650	3.92	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	4.68	4.26	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.50	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	423/1323	4.62	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1384	4.05	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	894/1378	4.10	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	3.71	4.24	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ART 332 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 121
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 122
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	737/1670	4.57	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1136/1666	4.39	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	932/1406	4.49	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	849/1615	4.57	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	706/1566	4.43	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1494/1528	3.58	3.88	4.12	4.07	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.09	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1287/1667	4.37	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	693/1626	4.37	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1062/1559	4.62	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1214/1560	4.74	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	864/1549	4.56	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	889/1546	4.62	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	871/1323	3.81	4.50	4.00	3.99	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	820/1384	4.38	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1067/1378	4.40	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	926/1378	4.53	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	605/ 904	4.26	4.24	4.03	4.03	3.80

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	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	11				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 123
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	453/1670	4.57	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	390/1666	4.39	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	261/1406	4.49	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	196/1615	4.57	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	295/1566	4.43	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	560/1528	3.58	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	985/1650	4.09	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1279/1667	4.37	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	467/1626	4.37	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	323/1559	4.62	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	417/1560	4.74	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	366/1549	4.56	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	265/1546	4.62	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	908/1323	3.81	4.50	4.00	3.99	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	257/1384	4.38	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	218/1378	4.40	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	253/1378	4.53	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	160/ 904	4.26	4.24	4.03	4.03	4.71
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	16				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 124
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	964/1670	4.37	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	1154/1666	3.92	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	898/1615	4.17	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.25	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1388/1650	3.35	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1444/1667	4.24	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	953/1626	4.06	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1455/1559	3.59	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	749/1549	4.10	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	889/1546	3.99	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	205/1323	4.23	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	820/1384	4.19	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1074/1378	4.12	4.46	4.29	4.30	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	850/1378	4.33	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 334 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 125
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	751/1670	4.37	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1398/1666	3.92	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.80	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1018/1615	4.17	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1566	4.40	4.07	4.07	4.04	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1580/1650	3.35	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1310/1667	4.24	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	877/1626	4.06	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1442/1559	3.59	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1308/1549	4.10	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1345/1546	3.99	4.39	4.32	4.24	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	917/1323	4.23	4.50	4.00	3.99	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	570/1384	4.19	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	751/1378	4.12	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	777/1378	4.33	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

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	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 126
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1363/1666	3.83	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1325/1615	3.75	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	6	1	3	3.25	1406/1566	3.25	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1559/1650	3.17	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1246/1667	4.42	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	4	5	0	3.17	1517/1626	3.17	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1439/1559	3.64	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1004/1560	4.73	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	1379/1549	3.55	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	1496/1546	2.91	4.39	4.32	4.24	2.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	529/1323	4.27	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1191/1384	3.29	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	915/1378	4.14	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	850/1378	4.29	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	0	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 343 0101
 Title HISTORY OF ANIMATION
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 127
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	10	8	17	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	12	13	3.89	1331/1666	3.89	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	14	13	4.09	1009/1406	4.09	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	10	24	4.66	302/1566	4.66	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	30	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	7	24	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	8	13	9	4.03	937/1626	4.03	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	486/1559	4.77	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	536/1560	4.91	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	6	23	4.49	709/1549	4.49	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	7	22	4.40	849/1546	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	6	27	4.76	178/1323	4.76	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	4	4	8	7	3.46	1118/1384	3.46	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	7	15	4.40	718/1378	4.40	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	541/1378	4.65	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	10	25	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 27
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 36 Non-major 9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 29	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 345 0101
 Title FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 128
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	790/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	300/1528	4.67	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	879/1650	4.27	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	849/1546	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	156/1323	4.80	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	498/1384	4.44	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	417/1378	4.78	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.24	4.03	4.03	4.50

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 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 347 0101
 Title WRITING FOR FILM
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 129
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1038/1670	4.21	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	467/1615	4.58	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	686/1566	4.21	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	315/1528	4.64	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1095/1650	4.07	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1295/1667	4.36	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	831/1626	4.17	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	1157/1559	4.25	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1180/1560	4.58	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1227/1549	3.92	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1222/1546	3.92	4.39	4.32	4.24	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1378	4.70	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.24	4.03	4.03	4.00

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 1	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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 13		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 361 0101
 Title DIGITAL DARKROOM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 130
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1167/1670	4.09	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1048/1666	4.18	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1033/1615	4.09	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	1	5	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.50	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1324/1650	3.82	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1326/1560	4.40	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1104/1549	4.10	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	1354/1546	3.60	4.39	4.32	4.24	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	217/1323	4.70	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	987/1384	3.78	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	878/1378	4.22	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	711/1378	4.44	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

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 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 13	Non-major 4
84-150	2	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 7		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 362 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTOGRP
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 131
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	544/1670	4.62	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	467/1615	4.58	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	734/1566	4.17	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	679/1528	4.29	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	846/1559	4.55	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	525/1549	4.64	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	782/1546	4.45	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	374/1323	4.45	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	940/1384	3.89	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378	4.89	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	405/ 904	4.20	4.24	4.03	4.03	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ART 362 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTOGRP
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 131
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 363 0101
 Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 132
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	833/1666	4.36	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.25	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1249/1559	4.11	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	762/1549	4.44	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	751/1378	4.38	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	570/1378	4.63	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.24	4.03	4.03	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 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 11	Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 365 0101
 Title SEQUENCE AND TIME
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 133
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	790/1566	4.10	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	1182/1528	3.70	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.83	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	156/1323	4.80	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	638/1384	4.30	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1378	4.90	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.24	4.03	4.03	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 1
84-150	3	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 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 370 0101
 Title SILKSCREEN PRINTING
 Instructor: BOWLER, RUTH S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 134
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	1344/1670	3.91	4.47	4.31	4.24	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	5	3	3.64	1465/1666	3.64	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1496/1615	3.40	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1544/1566	2.40	4.07	4.07	4.04	2.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1399/1528	3.25	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	5	1	2	0	0	1.63	1644/1650	1.63	4.04	4.22	4.12	1.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	1	7	0	3.27	1657/1667	3.27	4.75	4.67	4.67	3.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	5	3	0	2.90	1561/1626	2.90	4.26	4.11	4.06	2.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1499/1559	3.25	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1347/1560	4.38	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1459/1549	3.25	4.44	4.31	4.25	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1329/1546	3.67	4.39	4.32	4.24	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1295/1323	2.00	4.50	4.00	3.99	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1154/1384	3.38	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	751/1378	4.38	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	865/ 904	2.50	4.24	4.03	4.03	2.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 375 0101
 Title PHOTO/DIG PROC IN PRIN
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 135
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	****	4.07	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1404/1650	3.67	4.04	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1430/1667	4.17	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1218/1559	4.17	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1053/1549	4.17	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1141/1384	3.40	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	899/1378	4.20	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.03	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 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 7	Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MEDI
 Instructor: CRAWFORD, BONNI
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 136
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	557/1670	4.55	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	490/1666	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	3.86	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/1615	4.36	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1181/1566	3.68	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	938/1650	4.46	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.95	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	953/1626	4.15	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	772/1559	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.85	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	816/1549	4.40	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	482/1546	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	217/1323	4.75	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	987/1384	3.99	4.20	4.10	4.12	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	564/1378	4.68	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	711/1378	4.22	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	648/ 904	3.71	4.24	4.03	4.03	3.71

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 1		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	5	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	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 382 0201
 Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MEDI
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 137
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	665/1670	4.55	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	784/1666	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1158/1406	3.86	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	910/1615	4.36	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1200/1566	3.68	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	327/1650	4.46	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.95	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	670/1626	4.15	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	623/1559	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	855/1560	4.85	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	816/1549	4.40	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	595/1546	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	156/1323	4.75	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1384	3.99	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.68	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	977/1378	4.22	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.71	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

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	1	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 383 0101
 Title SOUND DESIGN
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 138
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	245/1615	4.80	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1122/1528	3.80	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	958/1667	4.73	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	4.89	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 384 0101
 Title INTRO 3D ANIMATION
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 139
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	165/1670	4.93	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	529/1666	4.57	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	644/1406	4.46	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	837/1615	4.29	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1524/1566	2.80	4.07	4.07	4.04	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1187/1528	3.69	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	782/1650	4.36	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	467/1626	4.46	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.79	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	323/1549	4.79	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	95/1323	4.92	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	670/1384	4.25	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

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 1
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 387 0101
 Title EXPRESSION TIME & MOTI
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 140
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.07	4.07	4.04	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1233/1528	3.60	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1008/1650	4.17	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1220/1626	3.80	4.26	4.11	4.06	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1431/1559	3.67	4.48	4.46	4.40	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.24	4.03	4.03	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	4				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 392 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: YAGER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 141
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	719/1666	4.44	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1566	****	4.07	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	532/1528	4.43	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.04	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1216/1667	4.44	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	911/1560	4.78	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	762/1549	4.44	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	172/1323	4.78	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.24	4.03	4.03	4.50

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	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 392A 0101
 Title WEB DESIGN
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, JASO
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 142
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.47	4.31	4.24	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	569/1666	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1250/1406	3.60	4.54	4.32	4.22	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1356/1615	3.70	4.42	4.24	4.18	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.07	4.07	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	5	2	0	2.89	1604/1650	2.89	4.04	4.22	4.12	2.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1052/1667	4.64	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.26	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	762/1549	4.44	4.44	4.31	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	482/1546	4.70	4.39	4.32	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.50	4.00	3.99	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1378	4.70	4.46	4.29	4.30	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 425 0101
 Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 143
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	578/1670	4.58	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	238/1615	4.82	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	300/1528	4.67	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1278/1650	3.90	4.04	4.22	4.28	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1626	4.91	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	253/1546	4.89	4.39	4.32	4.43	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	299/1323	4.56	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	348/1384	4.64	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1378	4.82	4.46	4.29	4.55	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	605/ 904	3.80	4.24	4.03	4.22	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: ART 428 0101
 Title THEORY/PRAC ART MUSEUM
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 144
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.54	4.32	4.48	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	245/1615	4.80	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	600/1528	4.36	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	222/1650	4.82	4.04	4.22	4.28	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.90	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1549	4.90	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	231/1546	4.90	4.39	4.32	4.43	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	119/1323	4.90	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	222/ 904	4.56	4.24	4.03	4.22	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	5.00	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	5.00	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: ART 428 0101
 Title THEORY/PRAC ART MUSEUM
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 144
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 430 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 145
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	490/1666	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1181/1566	3.70	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	611/1528	4.35	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	7	4	5	3.88	1293/1650	3.88	4.04	4.22	4.28	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	768/1667	4.85	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	1	5	9	4.12	1249/1559	4.12	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	658/1549	4.53	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	5	9	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.39	4.32	4.43	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1231/1323	2.88	4.50	4.00	4.10	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	384/1384	4.59	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	0	14	4.53	587/1378	4.53	4.46	4.29	4.55	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	640/1378	4.53	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	570/ 904	3.91	4.24	4.03	4.22	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 0
84-150	6	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 17		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: NUNOO-QUARCOO,
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 146
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	531/1670	4.63	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	895/1666	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	308/1615	4.73	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1144/1566	3.75	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.04	4.22	4.28	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	1072/1559	4.36	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.93	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	789/1549	4.43	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	582/1546	4.62	4.39	4.32	4.43	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	254/1323	4.64	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	348/1384	4.64	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	503/1378	4.64	4.46	4.29	4.55	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	470/1378	4.73	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	356/ 904	4.29	4.24	4.03	4.22	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	5	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	14				
				? 3						

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101
 Title DISCOVER HI-DEF
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 147
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1092/1666	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.42	4.24	4.37	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1200/1566	3.67	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1202/1528	3.67	3.88	4.12	4.26	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1439/1650	3.57	4.04	4.22	4.28	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1230/1559	4.14	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1252/1546	3.86	4.39	4.32	4.43	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	651/1384	4.29	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	915/1378	4.14	4.46	4.29	4.55	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.57	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.24	4.03	4.22	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: ART 447 0101
 Title SPECIAL FX & MOTION GF
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 148
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General																
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	290/1670	4.82	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.82		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	569/1666	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.55		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.48	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.50		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.00		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.26	****		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	645/1650	4.45	4.04	4.22	4.28	4.45		
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1477/1667	4.09	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.09		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.43		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	276/1559	4.91	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.91		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.91		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	634/1549	4.55	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.55		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	445/1546	4.73	4.39	4.32	4.43	4.73		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	119/1323	4.91	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.91		
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	962/1384	3.83	4.20	4.10	4.32	3.83		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.46	4.29	4.55	4.50		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.67		
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****		

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 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 0
84-150	6	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 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 465 0101
 Title INTERMEDIA STUDIO
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 149
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1379/1670	3.86	4.47	4.31	4.45	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1574/1666	3.29	4.37	4.27	4.35	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1486/1615	3.43	4.42	4.24	4.37	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	0	2	2.86	1518/1566	2.86	4.07	4.07	4.17	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1485/1528	2.83	3.88	4.12	4.26	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1612/1650	2.71	4.04	4.22	4.28	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.71	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.26	4.11	4.28	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1230/1559	4.14	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	4.44	4.31	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1252/1546	3.86	4.39	4.32	4.43	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.24	4.03	4.22	4.00

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 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 8	Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 484 0201
 Title ADVNCD 3D CMPUTR ANIMA
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 150
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.54	4.32	4.48	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.92	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.04	4.22	4.28	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	126/1626	4.89	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	248/1559	4.92	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.24	4.03	4.22	4.60

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 7		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 488 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:AIM
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 151
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	0	5	3.90	1318/1666	3.90	4.37	4.27	4.35	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.07	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1404/1650	3.67	4.04	4.22	4.28	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	712/1667	4.89	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1431/1559	3.67	4.48	4.46	4.58	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	4.44	4.31	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1452/1546	3.20	4.39	4.32	4.43	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1323	4.71	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	4.20	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.46	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.50	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 489A 0101
 Title PRINT MEDIA, PHOTOGRAP
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 152
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	173/1666	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.54	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1230/1566	3.60	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1306/1528	3.44	3.88	4.12	4.26	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	660/1650	4.44	4.04	4.22	4.28	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	191/1626	4.78	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	130/1323	4.88	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1384	4.88	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 489B 0101
 Title TIME-BASED
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 153
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.47	4.31	4.45	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1383/1666	3.80	4.37	4.27	4.35	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1200/1566	3.67	4.07	4.07	4.17	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	733/1528	4.22	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1388/1650	3.70	4.04	4.22	4.28	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.26	4.11	4.28	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.48	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	622/1549	4.56	4.44	4.31	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.20	4.10	4.32	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	564/1378	4.56	4.46	4.29	4.55	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	417/1378	4.78	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.24	4.03	4.22	4.00

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 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 0
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 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 489C 0101
 Title TIME-BASED
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 154
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	3.15	1609/1670	3.15	4.47	4.31	4.45	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1484/1666	3.58	4.37	4.27	4.35	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	7	1	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.42	4.24	4.37	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1566	****	4.07	4.07	4.17	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1506/1528	2.50	3.88	4.12	4.26	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	2	4	3	0	2.73	1612/1650	2.73	4.04	4.22	4.28	2.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1430/1667	4.17	4.75	4.67	4.73	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1329/1626	3.64	4.26	4.11	4.28	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1431/1559	3.67	4.48	4.46	4.58	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1457/1560	4.11	4.83	4.72	4.80	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1246/1549	3.89	4.44	4.31	4.43	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	5	3	0	3.11	1467/1546	3.11	4.39	4.32	4.43	3.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	641/1323	4.13	4.50	4.00	4.10	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	953/1384	3.86	4.20	4.10	4.32	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	548/1378	4.57	4.46	4.29	4.55	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	926/1378	4.14	4.50	4.31	4.60	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0104
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 155
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	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	1	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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 494 0144
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 156
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.42	4.24	4.37	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.28	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	1	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: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 157
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.37	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.50	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.60	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	5.00	5.00

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	2	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 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 158
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	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	1	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	0	Non-major	0
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	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 159
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	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	1	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	0	Non-major	0
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	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 160
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	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	1	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	0	Non-major	0
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	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 638 0123
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 161
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	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	1	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	0	Non-major	0
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	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 638 0140
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 162
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.53	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.69	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.63	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.50	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.33	3.97	4.32	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.65	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.58	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.65	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.59	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.59	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.60	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.67	5.00

Course-Section: ART 638 0140
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 162
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	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	0	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 163
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	931/1666	4.29	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.54	4.32	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.07	4.07	4.20	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	421/1528	4.50	3.88	4.12	4.33	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	831/1626	4.17	4.26	4.11	4.20	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1092/1559	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.49	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.83	4.72	4.81	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.44	4.31	4.37	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1273/1546	3.80	4.39	4.32	4.40	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	519/1384	4.43	4.20	4.10	4.21	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	842/1378	4.29	4.46	4.29	4.42	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	731/1378	4.43	4.50	4.31	4.51	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	74/ 87	4.00	4.75	4.65	4.61	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	70/ 75	3.50	4.63	4.57	4.66	3.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	72/ 79	3.50	4.50	4.45	4.58	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	4.33	3.97	4.32	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	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	6	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 690 0120
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 164
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	4.88	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	4.88	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.88	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.88	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.88	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.88	4.50	4.31	4.51	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	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 690 0125
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 165
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.88	4.47	4.31	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	4.83	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.88	4.07	4.07	4.20	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.83	4.04	4.22	4.30	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.88	4.39	4.32	4.40	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.88	4.20	4.10	4.21	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.88	4.46	4.29	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.88	4.50	4.31	4.51	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.61	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.60	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.67	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.90	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.92	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	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
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 690 0140
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 166
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	4.88	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	4.83	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	4.88	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.88	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.88	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.88	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.88	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	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 1	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 0	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			

Course-Section: ART 690 0141
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 167
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	4.88	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	4.83	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	4.88	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.88	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.88	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.88	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.88	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: ART 720A 0101
 Title THEORY/PRAC ART MUSEUM
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 168
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: ART 740 0101
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 169
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1620/1670	3.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1479/1666	3.60	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.42	4.24	4.33	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1566	****	4.07	4.07	4.20	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1233/1528	3.60	3.88	4.12	4.33	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1541/1650	3.25	4.04	4.22	4.30	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1534/1626	3.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.83	4.72	4.81	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	4.44	4.31	4.37	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1442/1546	3.25	4.39	4.32	4.40	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	4.20	4.10	4.21	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1358/1378	2.33	4.46	4.29	4.42	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.75	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.63	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 790 0140
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 170
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.53	5.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.63	4.57	4.66	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.65	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.58	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.62	4.65	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.59	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.60	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.67	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	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	0	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 790 0141
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 171
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.67	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.90	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		

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

Course-Section: ART 790 0142
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 172
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.42	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.07	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.20	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.46	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.04	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.53	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.69	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.58	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	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	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 792 0141
 Title THESIS PREP.
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 173
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.04	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.74	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.63	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.50	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	4.33	3.97	4.32	4.00

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	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						