

Course-Section: ART 210 0201  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS  
 Instructor: KISSACK, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 78  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1148/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1138/1576	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1444/1520	4.27	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	3.53	3.72	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	1418/1547	4.31	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1367/1574	4.17	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1166/1554	4.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1349/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.44	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.79	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	1330/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1200/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	839/1277	4.31	4.38	4.03	4.01	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	802/1279	4.47	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1269	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 210 0301  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS  
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 79  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	861/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.27	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1242/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1263/1434	3.53	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1547	4.31	4.01	4.19	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	4.00	1459/1574	4.17	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	805/1554	4.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.79	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	404/1277	4.31	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.47	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	784/1270	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****	

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	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 210 0401  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS  
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 80  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	500/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	152/1576	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	197/1520	4.27	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1142/1434	3.53	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	303/1547	4.31	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1288/1574	4.17	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.79	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	194/1277	4.31	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.47	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 10 Non-major 7
84-150	1	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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 211 0101  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM  
 Instructor: FARRELL, JOHN J  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 81  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	861/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1337/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	2	3	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	375/1547	4.52	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1018/1574	4.23	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	871/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	624/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1057/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	243/1277	4.66	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	554/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	559/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0201  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM  
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 82  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	976/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1138/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	4.89	4.58	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	805/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	4	3	3.31	1328/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1301/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	673/1547	4.52	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1386/1574	4.23	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	881/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	834/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1113/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	545/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	955/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	394/1277	4.66	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	712/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	793/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	425/ 878	4.26	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - 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: CAZABON, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 83  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	8	4.62	485/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	785/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	4.89	4.58	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	476/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	850/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	708/1547	4.52	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.23	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	692/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	339/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	194/1277	4.66	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	4.26	4.15	4.05	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0401  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM  
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 84  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	10	4.91	163/1576	4.52	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342	4.89	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	464/1520	4.54	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	439/1465	3.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	659/1434	3.60	3.72	4.14	4.06	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	375/1547	4.52	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1373/1574	4.23	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1488	4.71	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	172/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	105/1277	4.66	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1279	4.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	389/1270	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	299/ 878	4.26	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 11 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0101  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D  
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 85  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	5	2	0	1	2.18	1572/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	2.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	1	0	1	1.91	1576/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	1.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	2	0	1	2.09	1517/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	2.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	2	1	0	0	1.50	1465/1465	2.58	3.86	4.12	4.09	1.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	8	1	1	0	0	1.30	1434/1434	2.01	3.72	4.14	4.06	1.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	3	2	0	0	1.64	1544/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	1.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	8	1	0	1	0	1.40	1552/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	1.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	3	3	0	1	2.18	1483/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	2.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1402/1493	4.49	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	3	2	0	1	2.00	1483/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	3	0	0	1	1.64	1487/1489	3.48	4.28	4.32	4.31	1.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	4	4	2	0	1	2.09	1266/1277	3.96	4.38	4.03	4.01	2.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1270/1279	3.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	3	3	3	1	3.00	1208/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	10	0	1	0	0	1.18	1269/1269	3.88	4.50	4.35	4.29	1.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	4	2	0	1	0	1.71	875/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	3.92	1.71	

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 7		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	11
			? 0		



Course-Section: ART 212 0201  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D  
 Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 86  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	3	0	6	3.91	1241/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	811/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1330/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1360/1465	2.58	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	3	0	3	2.90	1392/1434	2.01	3.72	4.14	4.06	2.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1329/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1303/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	945/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1053/1493	4.49	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	922/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1236/1489	3.48	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	148/1277	3.96	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	641/1279	3.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	491/1269	3.88	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	415/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 87  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	434/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1145/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1427/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	571/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.49	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	350/1489	3.48	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	148/1277	3.96	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	445/1279	3.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	3.88	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	3.92	5.00

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 88  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	3	6	3	3.85	1291/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	1270/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	579/1520	3.76	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1366/1465	2.58	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	7	1	2	0	1	1.82	1433/1434	2.01	3.72	4.14	4.06	1.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	1	4	3.46	1360/1547	3.14	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.66	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	3	0	3.20	1405/1554	3.12	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1203/1488	3.93	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1337/1493	4.49	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	7	0	3	3.60	1307/1486	3.70	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	1274/1489	3.48	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	585/1277	3.96	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	910/1279	3.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	636/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	567/1269	3.88	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	603/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	3.92	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0101  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D  
 Instructor: RIOS, JORGE  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 89  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1325/1576	4.14	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1237/1576	4.16	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1068/1342	3.90	4.58	4.32	4.41	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1320/1520	4.20	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	708/1465	3.93	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1172/1434	3.56	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	1145/1547	3.76	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1417/1574	4.13	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1321/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.44	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1061/1486	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1200/1489	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	429/1277	4.56	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	962/1279	3.86	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	892/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	894/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	187/ 878	4.14	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.60	

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0201  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D  
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 90  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	829/1576	4.14	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1138/1576	4.16	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.20	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	571/1465	3.93	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	3.56	3.72	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.76	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1309/1574	4.13	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1060/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1197/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	763/1486	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1118/1489	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	283/1277	4.56	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	938/1279	3.86	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	928/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	852/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	464/ 878	4.14	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	

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	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	0	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0301  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D  
 Instructor: MAYHEW, JAMES M  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 91  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	928/1576	4.14	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	683/1576	4.16	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	3.90	4.58	4.32	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	683/1520	4.20	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1465	3.93	3.86	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1142/1434	3.56	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1547	3.76	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.13	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1096/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	311/1486	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	500/1489	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	148/1277	4.56	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	802/1279	3.86	4.19	4.17	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	696/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	4.14	4.15	4.05	3.92	****

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0401  
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D  
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 92  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	1065/1576	4.14	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	929/1576	4.16	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1342	3.90	4.58	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	707/1520	4.20	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1337/1465	3.93	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1263/1434	3.56	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	3	0	4	0	5	3.33	1396/1547	3.76	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1398/1574	4.13	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1096/1554	3.82	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	834/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	908/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	973/1486	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	955/1489	4.20	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	288/1277	4.56	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	906/1279	3.86	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	505/1270	4.31	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	421/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	589/ 878	4.14	4.15	4.05	3.92	3.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 214 0101  
 Title DRAWING I  
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 93  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	1	3	4	3.23	1506/1576	4.05	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	3	4	3.31	1474/1576	4.15	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1342	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1427/1520	4.15	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1448/1465	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	3	1	0	3	2.55	1414/1434	3.11	3.72	4.14	4.06	2.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1396/1547	3.67	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1431/1574	4.35	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.92	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1233/1488	4.50	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	1337/1493	4.65	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	0	3	3	3.40	1362/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1345/1489	4.14	4.28	4.32	4.31	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	5	0	0	2	1	2.25	1257/1277	3.20	4.38	4.03	4.01	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	0	1	0	3	2.56	1244/1279	3.78	4.19	4.17	4.14	2.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	897/1270	4.46	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1131/1269	4.22	4.50	4.35	4.29	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	4.00	4.15	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ART 214 0201  
 Title DRAWING I  
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 94  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.05	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	4.15	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.15	4.33	4.25	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1142/1434	3.11	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1041/1547	3.67	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	972/1574	4.35	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	3.92	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.40	4.47	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	4.65	4.80	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.14	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	623/1277	3.20	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	3.78	4.19	4.17	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.46	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	4.22	4.50	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.15	4.05	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 220 0101  
 Title ART HISTORY I  
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN  
 Enrollment: 121  
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 95  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	13	45	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	23	40	4.51	594/1576	4.51	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	50	4.63	443/1342	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	2	8	24	28	4.26	859/1520	4.26	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	2	10	14	32	4.15	758/1465	4.15	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	5	12	22	24	3.89	1009/1434	3.89	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	11	26	31	4.29	794/1547	4.29	4.01	4.19	4.22	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	59	4.88	508/1574	4.88	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	3	14	28	14	3.90	1067/1554	3.90	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	20	45	4.63	722/1488	4.63	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	61	4.91	501/1493	4.91	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	21	39	4.49	692/1486	4.49	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	6	10	48	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	0	6	11	38	4.46	356/1277	4.46	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	3	3	5	7	13	3.77	952/1279	3.77	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	4	5	9	12	3.87	1014/1270	3.87	4.50	4.35	4.30	3.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	1	3	8	7	12	3.84	1010/1269	3.84	4.50	4.35	4.29	3.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	37	25	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: ART 220 0101  
 Title ART HISTORY I  
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN  
 Enrollment: 121  
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 95  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	35	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	9	C	5	General	10	Under-grad	68	Non-major	41
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 221 0101  
 Title ART HISTORY II  
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL  
 Enrollment: 104  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 96  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	8	19	22	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	4	10	15	19	3.90	1237/1576	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	5	15	23	4.08	944/1342	4.08	4.58	4.32	4.41	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	4	8	14	15	3.98	1078/1520	3.98	4.33	4.25	4.26	3.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	6	12	28	4.35	554/1465	4.35	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	4	6	16	17	3.93	966/1434	3.93	3.72	4.14	4.06	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	8	17	18	3.96	1093/1547	3.96	4.01	4.19	4.22	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	39	4.80	683/1574	4.80	4.49	4.64	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	2	11	19	6	3.76	1159/1554	3.76	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	15	29	4.52	846/1488	4.52	4.40	4.47	4.44	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	7	40	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	8	16	21	4.13	1054/1486	4.13	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	15	28	4.38	845/1489	4.38	4.28	4.32	4.31	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	4	2	6	32	4.35	455/1277	4.35	4.38	4.03	4.01	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	5	2	8	3	13	3.55	1047/1279	3.55	4.19	4.17	4.14	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	4	1	11	5	10	3.52	1133/1270	3.52	4.50	4.35	4.30	3.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	4	8	7	9	3.57	1098/1269	3.57	4.50	4.35	4.29	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	24	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: ART 221 0101  
 Title ART HISTORY II  
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL  
 Enrollment: 104  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 96  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	52	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 305 0101  
 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES  
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 97  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	7	4.78	277/1576	4.78	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1576	4.89	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	594/1434	4.33	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1547	4.89	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1152/1574	4.44	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.15	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	293/1488	4.88	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1486	4.88	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.33	

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 0	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		6
			? 1			

Course-Section: ART 314 0101  
 Title DRAWING II  
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 98  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1042/1576	4.17	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1209/1342	3.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1418/1520	3.33	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1465	****	3.86	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1416/1434	2.50	3.72	4.14	4.15	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1506/1547	2.67	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1321/1493	4.33	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1363/1489	3.33	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	4.15	4.05	4.09	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 315 0101  
 Title VIDEO I  
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 99  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1366/1576	3.70	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1076/1576	4.10	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	994/1520	4.10	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1366/1465	3.11	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1404/1434	2.71	3.72	4.14	4.15	2.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1159/1547	3.89	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1417/1574	4.11	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1152/1554	3.78	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1101/1493	4.63	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1207/1486	3.88	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1352/1489	3.38	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	745/1279	4.14	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	881/1270	4.14	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1051/1269	3.71	4.50	4.35	4.41	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

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



Course-Section: ART 321 0101  
 Title 19TH CENTURY ART  
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 100  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	2	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	958/1576	4.24	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	2	5	5	10	3.79	1236/1520	3.79	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	2	4	4	8	3.35	1313/1465	3.35	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	4	4	6	7	3.42	1257/1434	3.42	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	0	9	12	4.17	924/1547	4.17	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	1	18	4	3.96	1484/1574	3.96	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	1	12	8	4.23	742/1554	4.23	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	198/1488	4.92	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	393/1486	4.72	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	263/1489	4.84	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	236/1277	4.64	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1022/1279	3.60	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	887/1270	4.13	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 27	Non-major 15
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 323 0101  
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART  
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 101  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	289/1576	4.65	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	785/1576	4.53	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	14	4.61	467/1342	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.61		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	1041/1520	4.25	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	6	7	3	3.29	1331/1465	3.83	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	1	9	6	3.71	1117/1434	4.04	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	8	7	3.86	1182/1547	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	4	1	14	1	3.60	1550/1574	3.93	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	860/1554	4.31	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	505/1488	4.77	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	619/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	251/1489	4.87	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	176/1277	4.84	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	802/1279	3.78	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	736/1270	4.07	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	915/1269	4.10	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 323 0101  
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART  
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 101  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ART 323 0201  
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART  
 Instructor: FAGAN, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 102  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	595/1576	4.65	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	378/1576	4.53	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	185/1342	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	511/1520	4.25	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	7	16	4.37	537/1465	3.83	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	15	4.36	574/1434	4.04	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	13	15	4.54	492/1547	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	20	7	4.26	1324/1574	3.93	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	395/1554	4.31	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	442/1488	4.77	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	582/1493	4.95	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	298/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	217/1489	4.87	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	42/1277	4.84	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	5	2	6	3.56	1038/1279	3.78	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	2	4	2	7	3.75	1054/1270	4.07	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	5	1	9	4.13	894/1269	4.10	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1	Major 21
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 28	Non-major 8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 22		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 325 0101  
 Title HIST OF FILM & VIDEO  
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 103  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	7	6	12	14	3.64	1392/1576	3.64	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.30	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	4	13	15	6	3.36	1456/1576	3.36	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.28	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	4	14	9	8	3.22	1277/1342	3.22	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	30	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	****/1520	****	4.33	4.25	4.25	****	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	2	6	8	19	4.08	808/1465	4.08	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	28	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1313/1434	3.25	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.25	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	1	2	5	12	19	4.18	916/1547	4.18	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.18	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	16	21	4.57	1033/1574	4.57	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.57	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	4	5	17	8	3.77	1152/1554	3.77	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.77	3.77
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	5	30	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	6	32	4.70	1017/1493	4.70	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.70	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	4	7	13	14	3.83	1225/1486	3.83	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.83	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	2	8	10	16	3.87	1205/1489	3.87	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.87	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	3	0	2	4	31	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.50	4.50
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	7	3	4	6	6	3.04	1182/1279	3.04	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.04	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	9	1	2	5	8	3.08	1201/1270	3.08	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.08	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	8	2	3	4	8	3.08	1207/1269	3.08	4.50	4.35	4.41	3.08	3.08
4. Were special techniques successful	20	20	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	4.25
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	5.00
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	5.00
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	5.00
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	5.00

Course-Section: ART 325 0101  
 Title HIST OF FILM & VIDEO  
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 103  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	11	Under-grad	44	Non-major	28
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 327 0101  
 Title CONT DIRECTIONS IN PHO  
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 104  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	9	0	0	1	3	9	16	4.38	818/1576	4.38	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	22	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	2	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	406/1520	4.59	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	187/1465	4.79	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	305/1434	4.63	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	2	1	1	4	10	9	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	1025/1574	4.57	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	246/1554	4.68	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	223/1493	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	298/1486	4.79	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	118/1277	4.85	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	568/1279	4.38	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	401/1270	4.76	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	386/1269	4.81	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	15	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 38 Non-major 25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 10	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 13	
			? 3		

Course-Section: ART 331 0101  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I  
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 105  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.49	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.67	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	527/1547	4.56	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1367/1574	4.14	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.44	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.92	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.78	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277	4.53	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1279	4.67	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	4.92	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	221/ 878	4.42	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ART 331 0201  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I  
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 106  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	893/1576	4.49	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	511/1520	4.67	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1337/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	399/1547	4.56	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	1431/1574	4.14	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	363/1554	4.44	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	4.92	4.40	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	325/1486	4.78	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	461/1489	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	421/1277	4.53	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	445/1279	4.67	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	326/1270	4.92	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	535/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.42	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.33	

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	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 332 0101  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II  
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 107  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	7	4.42	772/1576	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	939/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	339/1520	4.71	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1465	4.19	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	673/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1324/1574	4.20	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	924/1554	4.27	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	774/1488	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	584/1486	4.71	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	696/1489	4.71	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	356/1277	4.73	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	510/1279	4.66	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	505/1270	4.77	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.94	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 332 0201  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II  
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 108  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	347/1576	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	121/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	4.25	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.71	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1465	4.19	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	882/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1398/1574	4.20	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	371/1554	4.27	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	241/1486	4.71	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	174/1489	4.71	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	4.73	4.38	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1279	4.66	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.77	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	4.94	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	3.75	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	

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 14
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 109  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	7	4.58	527/1576	4.61	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	434/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	369/1342	4.71	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	546/1465	4.23	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1142/1434	4.17	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	985/1547	4.04	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1431/1574	4.04	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	871/1554	4.11	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	708/1488	4.60	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	784/1493	4.80	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	749/1486	4.51	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	754/1489	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	943/1277	3.73	4.38	4.03	4.11	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	732/1279	4.19	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1269	4.47	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.30	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 333 0301  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III  
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 110  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	457/1576	4.61	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	555/1576	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	333/1342	4.71	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	281/1520	4.73	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	803/1465	4.23	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.17	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1041/1547	4.04	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.04	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	849/1554	4.11	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	810/1488	4.60	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.80	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	619/1486	4.51	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	766/1489	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	856/1277	3.73	4.38	4.03	4.11	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	689/1279	4.19	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	505/1270	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	694/1269	4.47	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	187/ 878	4.30	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	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
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 334 0101  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV  
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 111  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1299/1576	3.46	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1275/1576	3.55	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	3.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1466/1520	3.14	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1465	2.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1497/1547	2.55	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1532/1574	3.64	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1350/1554	2.85	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1484/1488	2.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1471/1486	2.75	4.33	4.32	4.32	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1480/1489	2.36	4.28	4.32	4.34	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1249/1279	2.83	4.19	4.17	4.20	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.58	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.33	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 334 0201  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV  
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 112  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	1529/1576	3.46	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	1	3.27	1480/1576	3.55	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1433/1520	3.14	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1448/1465	2.50	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	0	4	0	2.30	1530/1547	2.55	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1559/1574	3.64	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	3	5	0	0	2.30	1539/1554	2.85	4.15	4.10	4.09	2.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1470/1488	2.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1321/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1421/1486	2.75	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1458/1489	2.36	4.28	4.32	4.34	2.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1267/1277	2.00	4.38	4.03	4.11	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1161/1279	2.83	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	716/1270	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	870/1269	4.58	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.33	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.33	

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 1	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 341 0101  
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION  
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 113  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1073/1576	4.51	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	939/1576	4.46	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1209/1342	3.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.77	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	0	3	3.00	1386/1465	3.57	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1167/1547	4.13	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1227/1574	4.31	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1110/1554	4.27	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1111/1488	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1101/1493	4.81	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	959/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1118/1489	4.38	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	385/1277	4.65	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1022/1279	4.30	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.90	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	728/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	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 1	Under-grad 8 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		



Course-Section: ART 341 0201  
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION  
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 114  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1576	4.51	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1576	4.46	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1342	3.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1520	4.77	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1465	3.57	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	718/1547	4.13	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1324/1574	4.31	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.27	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	870/1488	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	4.81	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	4.38	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.65	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.30	4.19	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.90	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.70	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 343 0101  
 Title HISTORY OF ANIMATION  
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 115  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	5	12	13	4.27	940/1576	4.27	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	13	14	4.37	811/1576	4.37	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	443/1342	4.63	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	441/1520	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	13	15	4.37	546/1465	4.37	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	978/1434	3.92	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6	21	4.57	457/1547	4.57	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	742/1554	4.23	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	582/1493	4.89	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	660/1489	4.54	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	110/1277	4.89	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	4	13	4.23	689/1279	4.23	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	798/1270	4.32	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	590/1269	4.59	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	451/ 878	4.08	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 3	Under-grad 32 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 345 0101  
 Title FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE  
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 116  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	727/1576	4.44	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	968/1576	4.22	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1194/1465	3.63	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1320/1434	3.22	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1325/1547	3.56	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1417/1574	4.11	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1374/1488	3.63	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	981/1486	4.22	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		
			? 0		
					8

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

Course-Section: ART 347 0101  
 Title WRITING FOR MEDIA ARTS  
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 117  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	5	8	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	835/1342	4.25	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	744/1520	4.36	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	813/1465	4.07	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	226/1434	4.71	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	992/1547	4.08	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	331/1554	4.58	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1077/1493	4.64	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	393/1279	4.58	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	252/ 878	4.45	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 361 0101  
 Title DIGITAL DARKROOM  
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 118  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	420/1576	4.64	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1081/1465	3.79	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	3	3	4	3.38	1270/1434	3.38	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1010/1488	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1184/1493	4.54	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	1080/1489	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	394/1277	4.42	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	649/1279	4.27	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.82	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	559/1269	4.64	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	8	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 362 0101  
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTOGRP  
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 119  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	301/1576	4.73	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	161/1520	4.87	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1180/1465	3.64	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	9	1	3.69	1127/1434	3.69	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	737/1547	4.36	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	250/1277	4.62	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	488/1279	4.46	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	208/1270	4.92	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	432/1269	4.77	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 368 0101  
 Title DIGITAL ALTERNATIVES  
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 120  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1277	4.60	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****

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 1 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 9 Non-major 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	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 3	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 369 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY  
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 121  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	9	4.64	443/1576	4.64	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	910/1576	4.29	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	311/1520	4.69	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1360/1465	3.14	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1063/1434	3.80	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1554	4.92	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	350/1489	4.78	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 9	Under-grad 13 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		



Course-Section: ART 375 0101  
 Title PHOTO/DIG PROC IN PRIN  
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 122  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1023/1576	4.17	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1386/1486	3.25	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	4.38	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.50	

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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
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 382 0101  
 Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MEDI  
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 123  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	637/1576	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	996/1576	4.15	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.38	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1431/1465	3.25	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1142/1434	3.67	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	784/1547	4.40	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1079/1574	4.53	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	924/1554	3.64	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	750/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1017/1493	4.60	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1233/1486	3.78	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	696/1489	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	489/1277	4.29	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	962/1279	3.13	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	827/1270	4.04	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	819/1269	4.21	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 382 0201  
 Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MEDI  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 124  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1241/1576	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.30	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	0	7	4.10	1076/1576	4.15	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	4.60	4.58	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	1041/1520	4.38	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1102/1465	3.25	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	3.67	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	527/1547	4.40	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1041/1574	4.53	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1381/1554	3.64	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1192/1488	4.36	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1210/1493	4.60	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1253/1486	3.78	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	0	0	5	3.50	1313/1489	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	506/1277	4.29	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1249/1279	3.13	4.19	4.17	4.20	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1024/1270	4.04	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	870/1269	4.21	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 383 0101  
 Title SOUND DESIGN  
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 125  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	415/1576	4.77	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	476/1576	4.61	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	418/1520	4.46	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1292/1465	3.40	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	690/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1529/1574	4.30	4.49	4.64	4.61	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	589/1488	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.87	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	499/1486	4.76	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	526/1489	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	118/1277	4.74	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.45	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	805/1270	4.35	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	793/1269	4.55	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	3.95	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.40	

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 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 3
84-150	5	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 14	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 383 0201  
 Title SOUND DESIGN  
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 126  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.77	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1576	4.61	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	768/1520	4.46	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	3.40	3.86	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	838/1547	4.32	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.30	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.87	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	201/1486	4.76	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	552/1489	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	243/1277	4.74	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	712/1279	4.45	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	736/1270	4.35	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.55	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.95	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 387 0101  
 Title EXPRESSION TIME & MOTI  
 Instructor: SHEPPARD, JENNY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 127  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1263/1434	3.40	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.49	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1277	4.83	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	665/1279	4.25	4.19	4.17	4.20	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7 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 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 390 0101  
 Title IRC FELLOWS TOPICS  
 Instructor: BOOT, LEE  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 128  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1019/1576	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1454/1520	3.17	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1431/1465	2.75	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	1353/1434	3.13	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1506/1547	2.67	4.01	4.19	4.21	2.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1431/1554	3.10	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1388/1488	3.50	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1471/1486	2.50	4.33	4.32	4.32	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1255/1489	3.75	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	938/1279	3.80	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1116/1270	3.60	4.50	4.35	4.42	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1188/1269	3.20	4.50	4.35	4.41	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.15	4.05	4.09	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 392A 0101  
 Title WEB INTERFACE DESIGN  
 Instructor: CORDOVA, VIVIAN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 129  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.30	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1364/1576	3.62	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.33	4.25	4.25	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	3	3.38	1299/1465	3.38	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1364/1434	3.08	3.72	4.14	4.15	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1360/1547	3.46	4.01	4.19	4.21	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	4	4	0	2.91	1485/1554	2.91	4.15	4.10	4.09	2.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1433/1488	3.20	4.40	4.47	4.47	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1414/1486	3.10	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	802/1277	3.90	4.38	4.03	4.11	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1161/1279	3.17	4.19	4.17	4.20	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 13 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	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 7	
			? 2		



Course-Section: ART 392B 0101  
 Title ART AND COMMUNITY  
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 130  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1465	4.80	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.15	4.10	4.09	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.09	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

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 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 5	Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	3	
?	0			

Course-Section: ART 423 0101  
 Title ART SINCE 1945  
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 131  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	13	4.93	130/1576	4.93	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	244/1576	4.79	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	430/1342	4.64	4.58	4.32	4.46	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	424/1465	4.46	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	625/1434	4.31	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	708/1547	4.38	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.69	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	484/1488	4.77	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1486	4.69	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	461/1489	4.69	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	121/1277	4.85	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.15	4.05	4.33	4.67	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.90	****	

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	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 429B 0101  
 Title ALTERNATIVE AESTHETICS  
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 132  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	698/1576	4.44	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	290/1465	4.63	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	647/1434	4.29	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.25	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	350/1489	4.78	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.88	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 430 0101  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI  
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 133  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	244/1576	4.79	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	167/1520	4.86	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	335/1465	4.56	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	167/1434	4.79	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	228/1547	4.77	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	173/1554	4.79	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	155/1489	4.93	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	347/1277	4.46	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00	

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 0 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 431 0101  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII  
 Instructor: NUNOO-QUARCOO,  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 134  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	289/1576	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	336/1576	4.39	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1342	4.83	4.58	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	239/1520	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	366/1465	4.08	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1434	4.00	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	999/1547	3.71	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	12	4	4.18	1379/1574	4.30	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1554	4.58	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	4.75	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1486	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	194/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1279	4.75	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1270	4.69	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	129/ 878	4.40	4.15	4.05	4.33	4.80	

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 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 431 0201  
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII  
 Instructor: NUNOO-QUARCOO,  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 135  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	527/1576	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	1088/1576	4.39	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.83	4.58	4.32	4.46	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	731/1520	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1166/1465	4.08	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	2	1	3	3.11	1356/1434	4.00	3.72	4.14	4.30	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	1389/1547	3.71	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1189/1574	4.30	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	623/1554	4.58	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	870/1488	4.75	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	678/1486	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	888/1489	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.75	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	445/1279	4.75	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	756/1270	4.69	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.40	4.15	4.05	4.33	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101  
 Title ICONOGRAPHY & MEANING  
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 136  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	2	2	3.86	1283/1576	3.86	4.36	4.30	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	515/1576	4.57	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.30	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1334/1488	3.83	4.40	4.47	4.55	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1025/1486	4.17	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1020/1489	4.17	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	728/1269	4.40	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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



Course-Section: ART 484 0201  
 Title ADVNCD 3D CMPUTR ANIMA  
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 137  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1342	4.83	4.58	4.32	4.46	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1465	****	3.86	4.12	4.22	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	298/1554	4.63	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	530/1486	4.63	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	228/1489	4.88	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.88	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 488 0101  
 Title ADV TOPICS:AIM  
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 138  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1333/1576	3.69	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	929/1520	4.18	4.33	4.25	4.38	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	1445/1465	2.57	3.86	4.12	4.22	2.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1434	****	3.72	4.14	4.30	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1231/1547	3.78	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.15	4.10	4.24	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	1209/1488	4.08	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1025/1486	4.17	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.15	4.05	4.33	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 13	Non-major 1
84-150	3	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 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 489A 0101  
 Title PRINT MEDIA, PHOTOGAP  
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 139  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	4	4	3	3.12	1526/1576	3.12	4.36	4.30	4.46	3.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	6	3	3.47	1405/1576	3.47	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	0	8	3	3.44	1388/1520	3.44	4.33	4.25	4.38	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	5	1	2.85	1422/1465	2.85	3.86	4.12	4.22	2.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	5	1	0	3	1	2.40	1424/1434	2.40	3.72	4.14	4.30	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	2	1	5	3	3.58	1311/1547	3.58	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.49	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	6	3	3	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.15	4.10	4.24	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1362/1493	4.23	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1197/1486	3.91	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1381/1489	3.25	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	943/1277	3.67	4.38	4.03	4.04	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	5	1	3.40	1106/1279	3.40	4.19	4.17	4.31	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	818/1270	4.27	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	992/1269	3.91	4.50	4.35	4.55	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 489B 0101  
 Title TIMEBASED:VID,FLM,ANIM  
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 140  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.58	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1434	4.86	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	978/1547	4.09	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.15	4.05	4.33	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 489C 0101  
 Title TEAM-BASED GAME PROJEC  
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 141  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1546/1576	2.88	4.34	4.27	4.35	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1505/1520	2.63	4.33	4.25	4.38	2.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1465	****	3.86	4.12	4.22	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1427/1434	2.33	3.72	4.14	4.30	2.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	3	1	0	2.25	1532/1547	2.25	4.01	4.19	4.24	2.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1517/1554	2.63	4.15	4.10	4.24	2.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1480/1488	2.33	4.40	4.47	4.55	2.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1321/1493	4.33	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1461/1486	2.67	4.33	4.32	4.41	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	0	0	2.33	1475/1489	2.33	4.28	4.32	4.38	2.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	1238/1277	2.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1249/1279	2.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.50	4.35	4.53	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	4.50	4.35	4.55	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 492 0101  
 Title TOPICS:ART OR MEDIA II  
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, JASO  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 142  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	0	1	5	4.13	1073/1576	4.13	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.33	4.25	4.38	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1424/1434	2.40	3.72	4.14	4.30	2.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1316/1547	3.57	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.49	4.64	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	849/1554	4.13	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	845/1489	4.38	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.19	4.17	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1024/1270	3.83	4.50	4.35	4.53	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.15	4.05	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0125  
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH  
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 143  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	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	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 495 0134  
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH  
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 144  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.67	3.72	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.67	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 145  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0145  
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH  
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 146  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.67	3.72	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.67	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0146  
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH  
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 147  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.80	4.36	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.67	3.72	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.67	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.80	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.50	4.38	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 624 0101  
 Title ART & CRIT  
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 148  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	958/1576	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1003/1520	4.08	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	748/1465	4.15	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	978/1434	3.92	3.72	4.14	4.35	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1056/1574	4.54	4.49	4.64	4.75	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	584/1554	4.36	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	982/1488	4.42	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	861/1486	4.36	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.38	4.03	4.08	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	488/1279	4.46	4.19	4.17	4.34	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	550/1270	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	677/1269	4.46	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	694/ 878	3.57	4.15	4.05	4.11	3.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		Non-major 9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	13

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

Course-Section: ART 638 0125  
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM  
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 149  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.36	4.30	4.43	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1460/1465	2.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.38	4.03	4.08	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	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 640 0101  
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD  
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 150  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	708/1465	4.20	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	3.72	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1202/1574	4.40	4.49	4.64	4.75	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.19	4.17	4.34	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.15	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.10	****	

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	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	6	Non-major	6
84-150	0	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	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 740 0101  
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO  
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 151  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	515/1576	4.57	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	291/1520	4.71	4.33	4.25	4.36	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	616/1465	4.29	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	3.72	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	900/1547	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1150/1493	4.57	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	623/1277	4.14	4.38	4.03	4.08	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.19	4.17	4.34	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.10	5.00	

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

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 152  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.38	4.03	4.08	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.33	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.75	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 790 0142  
 Title IND. STUDIES  
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 153  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.00	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ART 792 0138  
 Title THESIS PREP.  
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 154  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.25	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.75	4.01	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	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	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						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 155  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	637/1576	4.25	4.36	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.33	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434	4.50	3.72	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.75	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.49	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.15	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.38	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.19	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.15	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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