

Course Section: ENGL 100 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 707  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	590/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	412/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	441/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	265/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	249/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	234/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	481/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	170/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	473/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	621/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	380/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1227/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	340/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	632/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	923/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 13
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 7	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 708  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	9	1	3.25	1563/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	5	3.75	1334/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	969/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	5	3.70	1279/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	4	4	3.20	1383/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	3	8	3.80	1101/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	1	4	8	3.58	1365/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	731/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	10	6	1	3.26	1452/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1277/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1231/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	932/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1025/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1305/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	3	0	3	3.22	1374/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	865/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	908/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 2	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	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 7	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 709  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	914/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	412/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	773/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	673/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1062/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	180/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	281/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1049/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	666/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	505/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	650/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	386/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	744/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	846/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	422/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	427/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	368/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	271/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.45	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 710  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1124/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	814/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	717/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	453/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	608/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	885/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1394/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1052/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	986/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	621/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	926/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	531/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1231/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	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: ENGL 100 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 711  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	889/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	332/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	424/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	7	3.89	947/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	195/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	458/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	220/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	113/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	243/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	623/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	812/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	558/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	0	1	9	4.15	944/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	500/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	199/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	12
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
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
			? 3		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 714  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	340/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	115/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1132/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1022/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	959/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1036/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	880/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	920/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 8 Non-major 8
84-150	0	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 2	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 715  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	5	4	3.47	1493/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1065/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	2	7	3.47	1249/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	618/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1241/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	6	8	2	3.65	1630/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	3.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	538/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	1022/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	438/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	965/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	929/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	749/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	595/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	467/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	666/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	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 2	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 716  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1320/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1222/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	533/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	828/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1620/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	3.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	810/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1022/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	800/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1069/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	920/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 718  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	793/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	676/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	539/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	277/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	218/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	161/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	713/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1082/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1055/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	637/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	980/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	340/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	486/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	235/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 16
84-150	1	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 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 719  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	8	4	3	3.10	1589/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	1273/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1061/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	3	7	3.45	1398/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	3	5	4	3.05	1420/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	3	6	3.50	1260/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	4	4	8	3.84	1214/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	2	1	2	10	1	3.44	1387/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	9	5	3.70	1341/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	2	2	14	4.30	1319/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	9	4	3.70	1261/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	6	4	5	3.35	1357/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	6	3	2	2.82	1392/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	7	1	5	3.29	1367/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	1214/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	2	4	2	2	1	2.64	964/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	2.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	206/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	3.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	178/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	220/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	3.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 719  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 1101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 720  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	951/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	281/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	632/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	382/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	301/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	250/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	697/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	939/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	423/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	727/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	300/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	273/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	232/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	358/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	224/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	810/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 1201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 721  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	6	2	2	3.14	1583/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1273/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1174/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1140/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	3	4	3.21	1378/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	4	3.43	1294/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	4	3.36	1464/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1492/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	7	5	1	3.36	1420/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1003/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	825/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1220/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1258/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1057/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	849/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1392/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1018/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	841/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		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	6



Course Section: ENGL 100 1401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 722  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	1145/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	399/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	455/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	389/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	234/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	566/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	788/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	10	9	4.30	631/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	1076/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	973/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	451/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	534/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	1.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	170/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	595/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	419/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 3	A 7	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
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	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 1501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 725  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	511/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	149/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	146/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	285/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	1017/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1144/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	423/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	113/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	76/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	115/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	519/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	141/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	926/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	344/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 1501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 725  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 100 1601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 727  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	2	3.53	1471/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	827/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	946/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	6	3	3.29	1340/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	819/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	1113/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1503/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	10	4	4.00	918/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	939/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	862/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	702/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	926/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	731/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	692/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	613/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	309/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	862/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 1601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 727  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						



Course Section: ENGL 100 1701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 731  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	478/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	134/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	492/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	298/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	446/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	666/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	473/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	621/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	471/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	552/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	512/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	532/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	862/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 9	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	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 6	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 1801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 732  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	5	3	3.56	1454/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1059/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	916/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	875/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1280/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	857/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1310/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1492/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	9	0	3.60	1312/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	10	3	3.88	1281/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	760/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	753/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	965/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	2	6	0	3	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1088/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	657/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	3	2	7	3	3.67	694/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 1901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 733  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1103/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	814/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	516/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	465/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	955/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	965/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	800/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	799/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	307/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	556/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	770/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	3	2	2	0	2.86	1173/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	445/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	754/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	434/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	1	0	9	3	2	3.33	841/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	7	A	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	15	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	20
			Other	5	Major
					Non-major
					19
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ENGL 100 2001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 734  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	988/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	814/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	641/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	438/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	465/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	5	8	3.90	1161/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	690/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	679/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	777/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	547/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	890/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	340/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	427/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	168/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	364/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.29	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	4	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 2101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 738  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	8	4	3.57	1449/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	1424/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	773/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	5	7	5	3.74	1262/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	8	3	6	3.55	1202/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1019/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	1	3	4	8	3.55	1373/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	901/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	4	2	8	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1389/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1330/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	7	1	1	1	0	1.60	1287/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	1.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	4	0	2	1	2.75	1450/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
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 5	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 2201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 742  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	7	1	3.50	1480/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	2	3.79	1320/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1072/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	922/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1037/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	562/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1043/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1451/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	8	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	7	1	3.50	1389/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1354/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	7	3	3.79	1220/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	7	2	3.50	1319/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	1	3.38	1220/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1154/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1294/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	914/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 2201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 742  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100 2301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 744  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	7	2	3.53	1471/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	4	3.79	1320/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	4	5	3.58	1198/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	911/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1413/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	4	9	4.00	895/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1223/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	9	1	3.59	1321/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	8	3	3.82	1299/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	843/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1005/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1132/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1217/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1029/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	4	1	11	4.24	893/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	718/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	555/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	68/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 2301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 744  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 2401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 747  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	13	5	3.95	1230/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	591/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	847/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	739/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	8	8	3.91	939/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	735/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	334/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	3	4.14	1457/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	779/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	553/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	512/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	360/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	446/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	6	4	8	4	3.45	967/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	709/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	950/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	622/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	759/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	Under-grad 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 21
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	5
?	0		

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 748  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	389/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	302/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	591/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	438/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0102  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 750  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	318/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	828/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	436/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 753  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	3	0	2.92	1614/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	2.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1387/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	863/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1326/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	844/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1361/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1382/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1293/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	7	2	3.82	1303/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1364/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1219/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1107/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1135/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	841/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
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 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0202  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 754  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1332/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	984/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	466/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	801/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	584/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	390/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	839/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1438/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1108/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1341/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1361/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1210/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	4	3	3.70	1262/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1178/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	979/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1285/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1310/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 755  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1550/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1466/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	969/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1334/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1272/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1260/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	992/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1501/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	1152/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	905/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	0	2	3	3.22	1278/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	3	0	4	3.44	1323/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1181/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0302  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 756  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	264/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	849/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1223/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	694/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.04	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	3.97	3.95	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.00	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.08	4.31	4.08	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.19	4.45	4.26	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.08	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	4.15	4.34	4.22	5.00	

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0302  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 756  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	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: ENGL 100A 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 759  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1110/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	505/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	280/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	975/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1021/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	838/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	435/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1382/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	1070/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	936/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	519/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1219/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	1	1	5	3.55	919/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	965/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	1	4	3.67	1253/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1181/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	694/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0402  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 760  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	590/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	171/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	344/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.04	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 4	Non-major 4
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: ENGL 100A 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 763  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1235/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1308/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	863/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	715/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	608/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	839/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1594/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	373/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	679/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	788/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	464/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	868/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	622/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1117/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	640/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	862/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 766  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	2	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1042/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	886/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	875/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1207/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1210/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	435/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	335/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1174/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1231/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	765/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	809/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	3	1	3	2	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	956/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	978/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	909/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	694/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0602  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 768  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1042/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1189/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1087/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	353/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	270/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	690/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	993/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	936/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	765/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	892/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	0	5	3	3.70	818/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	812/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1013/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1015/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	632/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.83	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 769  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1307/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	634/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1100/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1045/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	282/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	918/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1082/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1028/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	556/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	970/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1253/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	684/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	617/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0702  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 771  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1026/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	984/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	746/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	899/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1227/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	390/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1149/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	1068/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	993/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	1231/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1168/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	1300/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1069/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1225/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	893/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	896/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.18	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 773  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1409/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	777/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1205/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1179/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1045/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1035/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1421/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1412/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1277/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1277/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1285/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1036/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	574/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	891/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	5.00	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	5.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	5.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	5.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	5.00	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	5.00	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	5.00	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 773  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0802  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 774  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	814/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	701/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	496/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1111/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	440/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1214/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	857/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	939/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1069/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	702/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	809/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	1	4	1	1	2.60	1213/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	849/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	772/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	657/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	729/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.60	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100C 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 776  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	1253/1669	3.94	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	483/1666	4.56	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	242/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1118/1555	3.69	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	1	10	4.31	790/1647	4.31	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1464/1668	4.13	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	647/1514	4.63	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	1000/1551	4.20	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	12	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	7	5	3.87	725/1311	3.87	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	945/1490	3.92	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	613/1489	4.58	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	6	2	1	3.20	891/1006	3.20	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100C 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 776  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100H 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 778  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	183/1669	4.83	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	461/1666	4.58	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	1395/1555	3.17	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1300/1647	3.70	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1605	4.83	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	438/1503	4.63	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	521/1506	4.63	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.20	4.05	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	110/1006	4.86	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100P 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 779  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	1	7	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	5	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	5	2	3	2.93	1541/1647	2.93	4.02	4.12	4.06	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.93	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1172/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.00	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1284/1514	4.43	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1361/1551	4.35	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	2	6	3.80	1210/1503	4.15	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1142/1506	4.47	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	4	5	4	1	3.14	1091/1311	2.87	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.87	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	859/1502	4.29	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1020/1489	4.07	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	677/1006	3.69	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.69	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 781  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1409/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	1	7	3	5	3.32	1531/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	14	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1312/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	5	6	4	3.50	1227/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	819/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	7	5	2	3	1	2.22	1610/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	2.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	6	3	4	2	3.00	1501/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	3	4	2	5	2	2.94	1468/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	1176/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	4	2	5	3	3.19	1404/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	3	4	2	2.88	1424/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	2	0	4	3.00	1328/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	2	0	7	4.00	1013/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	837/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	855/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	56/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	61/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	4.22	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	56/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	4.22	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	69/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	4.10	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	39/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
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	3				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 784  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1090/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1028/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	370/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1187/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	218/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	4	2	8	3.94	1125/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1164/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	955/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1168/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	800/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	958/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	742/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	0	2	7	3.83	1160/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	596/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	459/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 785  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1173/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	10	7	4.21	935/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	612/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	709/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	325/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	651/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	4.05	1503/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	163/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	739/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	510/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	594/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	882/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	214/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	495/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	280/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	7	4	2	3.50	759/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	98/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	65/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	4.10	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	1	4	1	2.80	86/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	2.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	1	5	0	2.70	98/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	2.70	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	66/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	3.90	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 11	A 5	Required for Majors	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 787  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1437/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	4	3.87	1265/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1135/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1393/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1465/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1152/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	4	2	4	3.20	1504/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1223/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1293/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1418/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1469/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	7	4	1	3.07	1419/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	3	5	3.60	1300/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	7	1	2	1	2	2.23	1261/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1311/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1346/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1459/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	2.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	914/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	2	2	4	4	1	3.00	98/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	83/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	3.77	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	84/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	2.92	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	97/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	2.82	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	3	3	3	2	1	2.58	86/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	2.58	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 110 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 789  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1409/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1387/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1301/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1195/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1274/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1352/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1277/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1277/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1115/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	865/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	694/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: ENGL 110 0102  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 792  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1563/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1417/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1184/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1260/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1187/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1297/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1324/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1338/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1330/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	939/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1107/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1428/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1137/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	823/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	212/ 226	3.86	4.20	4.20	3.98	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	193/ 233	3.81	4.40	4.19	4.09	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	215/ 225	3.81	4.38	4.50	4.42	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	193/ 223	3.81	4.44	4.35	4.19	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	189/ 206	3.43	4.27	4.15	4.01	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	109/ 112	3.14	3.99	4.38	4.04	2.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	88/ 97	3.57	4.13	4.36	4.19	3.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	73/ 92	3.71	3.95	4.22	3.79	3.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	88/ 105	3.57	3.86	4.20	3.94	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	79/ 98	3.57	3.97	3.95	3.90	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	46/ 58	4.14	4.60	4.22	4.00	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	42/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	3.25	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	35/ 39	4.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	3.25	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	29/ 40	4.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	3.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	27/ 30	4.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	50/ 55	3.57	4.19	4.34	4.17	3.25	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	36/ 42	3.43	4.08	4.31	4.08	3.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	42/ 46	3.57	4.19	4.45	4.26	3.25	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	28/ 33	3.43	4.08	4.25	4.25	3.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	27/ 29	3.57	4.15	4.34	4.22	3.25	

Course Section: ENGL 110 0102  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 792  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 110 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 796  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	418/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	401/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	407/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1057/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	389/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	235/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	3.86	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.81	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	3.81	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	3.43	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	3.14	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	3.57	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	3.71	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	3.57	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	3.57	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	4.14	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	4.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	4.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	3.57	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	3.43	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	3.57	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	3.43	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	

Course Section: ENGL 110 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 796  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 110 0202  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 799  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	914/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1387/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1251/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1227/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1138/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1560/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1082/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1338/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1027/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1301/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	967/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	3.86	4.20	4.20	3.98	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	3.81	4.40	4.19	4.09	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	187/ 225	3.81	4.38	4.50	4.42	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	164/ 223	3.81	4.44	4.35	4.19	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	117/ 206	3.43	4.27	4.15	4.01	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	81/ 112	3.14	3.99	4.38	4.04	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 97	3.57	4.13	4.36	4.19	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	63/ 92	3.71	3.95	4.22	3.79	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	72/ 105	3.57	3.86	4.20	3.94	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	46/ 98	3.57	3.97	3.95	3.90	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	4.14	4.60	4.22	4.00	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	4.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	4.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	4.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 55	3.57	4.19	4.34	4.17	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 42	3.43	4.08	4.31	4.08	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 46	3.57	4.19	4.45	4.26	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	19/ 33	3.43	4.08	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 29	3.57	4.15	4.34	4.22	4.00	

Course Section: ENGL 110 0202  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 799  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 210 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, VI  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 802  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	769/1669	4.24	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	412/1666	4.55	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	293/1421	4.61	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	18	4.44	583/1617	4.42	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	136/1555	4.71	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	4	17	4.38	534/1543	4.36	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	4	19	4.41	651/1647	4.52	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1668	4.56	4.49	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	11	8	4.13	820/1605	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	223/1514	4.71	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	205/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	289/1503	4.56	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	225/1506	4.71	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	2	3	7	6	3.41	995/1311	3.41	3.26	3.85	3.96	3.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	433/1490	4.41	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	741/1502	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	368/1489	4.76	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	459/1006	4.10	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.10	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17



Course Section: ENGL 210 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: KENDALL, GEORGE  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 803  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	20	15	4.11	1090/1669	4.24	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	9	28	4.47	605/1666	4.55	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	9	28	4.48	594/1421	4.61	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	15	21	4.39	651/1617	4.42	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	31	4.61	255/1555	4.71	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	13	23	4.33	580/1543	4.36	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	33	4.64	334/1647	4.52	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	39	5	4.11	1470/1668	4.56	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	23	13	4.29	654/1605	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	13	24	4.53	775/1514	4.71	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	9	29	4.68	1014/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	11	22	4.38	742/1503	4.56	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	10	27	4.57	575/1506	4.71	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	32	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/1311	3.41	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	658/1490	4.41	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	705/1502	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	490/1489	4.76	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	12	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/1006	4.10	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ENGL 210 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: KENDALL, GEORGE  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 803  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	31	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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	26				
				?	2						

Course Section: ENGL 226 0101  
 Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 804  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	8	4	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	12	3	3.68	1372/1666	3.68	4.17	4.19	4.29	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	871/1421	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	7	5	6	3.45	1265/1555	3.45	3.96	4.00	3.96	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	6	6	3.50	1260/1543	3.50	4.31	4.06	4.10	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	2	3	5	4	5	3.37	1459/1647	3.37	4.02	4.12	4.19	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	11	7	1	3.23	1649/1668	3.23	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	7	5	0	3.07	1498/1605	3.07	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	7	7	2	3.20	1438/1514	3.20	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1377/1551	4.14	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	6	5	5	3.61	1297/1503	3.61	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	4	7	6	3.62	1296/1506	3.62	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	1	3	0	1	2.38	1248/1311	2.38	3.26	3.85	3.96	2.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	5	2	5	3.40	1215/1490	3.40	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	4	1	8	3.93	1098/1489	3.93	4.49	4.29	4.36	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	2	2	1	0	3	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.89	4.00	3.99	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 17
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 8

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

Course Section: ENGL 241 0101  
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 805  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	8	7	6	3.42	1516/1669	3.42	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	10	5	3.46	1484/1666	3.46	4.17	4.19	4.29	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	3	6	12	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	9	10	3.81	1224/1617	3.81	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	12	4.20	611/1555	4.20	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	6	6	7	3.58	1232/1543	3.58	4.31	4.06	4.10	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	8	6	7	3.64	1331/1647	3.64	4.02	4.12	4.19	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	23	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	7	10	0	3.30	1441/1605	3.30	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	10	8	3.88	1277/1514	3.88	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	5	15	4.36	1289/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	6	9	3.80	1210/1503	3.80	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	8	11	4.04	1051/1506	4.04	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	4	4	8	3.57	1128/1490	3.57	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	5	2	3	10	3.76	1202/1502	3.76	4.28	4.26	4.31	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	5	1	4	11	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	19	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	15
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 18		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 243A 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF WAR  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 806  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	0	7	3	3.62	1432/1669	3.62	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1051/1421	3.92	4.29	4.24	4.35	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1140/1617	3.93	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	207/1555	4.69	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	9	2	3.77	1130/1543	3.77	4.31	4.06	4.10	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	948/1647	4.17	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1039/1668	4.69	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	8	2	3.69	1255/1605	3.69	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1343/1514	3.69	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1223/1551	4.46	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	7	3	3.85	1193/1503	3.85	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	1265/1506	3.69	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	818/1311	3.70	3.26	3.85	3.96	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1055/1490	3.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	978/1502	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	909/1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 243B 0101  
 Title COMIC BOOK LITERATURE  
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 807  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	22	4.55	505/1666	4.55	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	210/1421	4.82	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	382/1617	4.61	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	171/1555	4.75	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	2	25	4.68	242/1543	4.68	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	250/1647	4.72	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	1	12	11	6	3.65	1630/1668	3.65	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	787/1514	4.52	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	205/1551	4.97	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	360/1503	4.69	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	261/1506	4.83	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	432/1311	4.28	3.26	3.85	3.96	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	242/1490	4.78	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	456/1489	4.74	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	614/1006	3.89	3.89	4.00	3.99	3.89	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 243H 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF WAR  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 808  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.04	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.17	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.29	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.25	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.96	4.00	3.96	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.02	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.10	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.30	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.25	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.26	3.85	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	3.99	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.20	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.59	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.59	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	4.50	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	4.63	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	3.97	3.95	4.20	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	5.00	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.29	4.39	5.00	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.17	3.97	5.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.42	4.33	5.00	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.67	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.08	4.31	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.19	4.45	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.08	4.25	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	4.15	4.34	5.00	5.00	

Course Section: ENGL 243H 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF WAR  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 808  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 250 0101  
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE  
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 810  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	143/1669	4.88	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	181/1666	4.81	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	19	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	80/1555	4.92	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	21	4.65	258/1543	4.65	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	825/1668	4.85	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	8	11	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	151/1514	4.92	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	220/1503	4.81	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	188/1506	4.88	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	1	4	2	8	3.61	882/1311	3.61	3.26	3.85	3.96	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	279/1490	4.74	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	246/1502	4.89	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	456/1489	4.74	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	192/1006	4.63	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 17	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 271 0101  
 Title INTRO CREAT WRITG-FICTI  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 811  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	727/1666	4.38	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1421	4.78	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.78		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	15	4.42	626/1617	4.42	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	10	10	4.22	592/1555	4.22	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	21	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1289/1668	4.38	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	525/1605	4.38	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	653/1503	4.45	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	718/1506	4.45	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	299/1006	4.42	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 273 0101  
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 812  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1480/1669	4.02	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.73	4.17	4.19	4.29	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1372/1617	4.04	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	2.00	1545/1555	3.10	3.96	4.00	3.96	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	895/1543	4.43	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1586/1647	3.48	4.02	4.12	4.19	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1651/1668	3.92	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1428/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	1457/1514	3.89	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1111/1551	4.80	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1477/1503	3.59	4.25	4.24	4.29	2.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1470/1506	3.53	4.22	4.26	4.33	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.81	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1475/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.31	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1279/1489	4.13	4.49	4.29	4.36	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	4.80	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	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	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	5
84-150	2	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	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 273 0201  
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 813  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	556/1669	4.02	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	605/1666	3.73	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	424/1617	4.04	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	611/1555	3.10	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	119/1543	4.43	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	549/1647	3.48	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1068/1668	3.92	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	239/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	3.89	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	4.80	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	3.59	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	471/1506	3.53	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	372/1490	3.81	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	434/1489	4.13	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006	4.80	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: ENGL 291 0101  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 814  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	318/1669	4.36	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1666	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	142/1617	4.58	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	418/1555	3.93	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	123/1543	4.64	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	185/1647	4.32	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	926/1668	4.53	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	157/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1514	4.36	4.30	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.94	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1503	4.26	4.25	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	286/1506	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	261/1490	4.63	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	143/1006	4.70	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.75	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	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	9
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 291 0201  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 815  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	1014/1669	4.36	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	827/1666	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	760/1617	4.58	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	1	5	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.93	3.96	4.00	3.96	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	172/1543	4.64	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1385/1647	4.32	4.02	4.12	4.19	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.53	4.49	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	918/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1288/1514	4.36	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	409/1551	4.94	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1030/1503	4.26	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1153/1506	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	184/1490	4.63	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	500/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	185/1006	4.70	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 291 0301  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 816  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1001/1669	4.36	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1135/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.35	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.58	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	773/1555	3.93	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	608/1543	4.64	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	334/1647	4.32	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1605/1668	4.53	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1100/1514	4.36	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.94	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1255/1503	4.26	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1189/1506	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	667/1490	4.63	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	567/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1006	4.70	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.74	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 301 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 817  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	633/1669	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	165/1666	4.79	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	502/1421	4.63	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	151/1617	4.76	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	201/1555	4.84	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	266/1543	4.76	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	532/1647	4.48	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	863/1668	4.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	423/1605	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	243/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	914/1311	4.10	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	298/1490	4.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	567/1502	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	478/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	424/1006	4.47	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 301 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: WIEST, AIMEE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 818  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1253/1669	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	359/1666	4.79	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	356/1421	4.63	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	300/1617	4.76	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	112/1555	4.84	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	180/1543	4.76	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	933/1647	4.48	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1057/1605	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	257/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	528/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	693/1506	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	333/1311	4.10	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	232/1490	4.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	189/1502	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	209/1006	4.47	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 301 0301  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 819  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	143/1669	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	118/1666	4.79	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1421	4.63	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	207/1617	4.76	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	60/1555	4.84	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	111/1543	4.76	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	194/1647	4.48	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1503/1668	4.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	461/1605	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	154/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1506	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	389/1311	4.10	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	324/1490	4.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	166/1502	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	178/1006	4.47	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 18 Non-major 7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 303 0101  
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY  
 Instructor: OLIVER, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 820  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	231/1666	4.76	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	347/1617	4.65	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	324/1555	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	138/1543	4.81	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1358/1668	4.29	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	565/1605	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	243/1503	4.79	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	212/1506	4.87	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	170/1490	4.87	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1502	4.87	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 304 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA  
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 821  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	522/1669	4.56	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	634/1666	4.44	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	632/1421	4.44	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	583/1617	4.44	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	147/1555	4.79	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	700/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	566/1647	4.46	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	205/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	1	5	6	2	3.18	1081/1311	3.18	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	640/1490	4.32	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	543/1489	4.65	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	5	0	5	3	2	2.80	952/1006	2.80	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 25 Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	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 20	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 305 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA  
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 822  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	331/1421	4.72	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	184/1617	4.78	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	40/1555	4.96	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	210/1543	4.72	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	412/1647	4.56	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	16	7	4.30	1353/1668	4.30	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	298/1605	4.61	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	170/1514	4.92	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	147/1506	4.92	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	85/1490	4.94	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	513/1502	4.63	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	168/1489	4.94	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	

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	1	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	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	21				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 306 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 823  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	1164/1666	3.95	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	886/1421	4.17	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	626/1617	4.41	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	183/1555	4.74	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	863/1543	4.05	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	5	6	5	3.63	1337/1647	3.63	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1096/1668	4.63	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.46	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1551	****	4.52	4.66	4.70	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1503	****	4.25	4.24	4.28	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1506	****	4.22	4.26	4.30	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	512/1490	4.44	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	900/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	909/1489	4.28	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	965/1006	2.63	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 21
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
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 307 0101  
 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 824  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	293/1669	4.74	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	372/1666	4.65	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	305/1421	4.74	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	434/1617	4.57	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	50/1555	4.95	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	298/1543	4.61	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	185/1647	4.78	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	486/1605	4.41	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	325/1514	4.83	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	312/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	16	4.59	556/1506	4.59	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	507/1311	4.16	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	20	4.82	206/1490	4.82	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	595/1502	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	319/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	4	8	7	3.82	639/1006	3.82	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 308 0101  
 Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 825  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	534/1669	4.55	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	2	4	9	14	4.21	949/1666	4.21	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	5	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	520/1421	4.54	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	1	4	6	15	4.35	706/1617	4.35	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	120/1555	4.86	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	3	3	6	15	4.22	690/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	0	2	8	16	4.41	651/1647	4.41	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	16	11	4.41	1274/1668	4.41	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	398/1605	4.48	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	376/1514	4.79	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	27	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	4	6	17	4.39	730/1503	4.39	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	2	2	2	22	4.57	575/1506	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	4	3	17	4.54	246/1311	4.54	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	5	15	4.36	594/1490	4.36	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	5	3	16	4.36	790/1502	4.36	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	666/1489	4.52	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	4	1	7	1	8	3.38	819/1006	3.38	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 310 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN POETRY  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 826  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	516/1666	4.53	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	511/1421	4.56	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	554/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	141/1555	4.80	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	139/1647	4.86	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	423/1605	4.46	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	257/1514	4.87	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1506	4.73	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	464/1311	4.22	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	428/1490	4.54	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	296/1502	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	654/1006	3.77	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

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

Course Section: ENGL 320 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN CT  
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 827  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	4	10	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	5	7	3.78	1325/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	821/1617	4.24	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	453/1555	4.39	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	940/1647	4.18	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1265/1668	4.41	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	713/1605	4.23	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	2	2	7	3.73	1330/1514	3.73	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	5	0	8	3.93	1142/1506	3.93	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	717/1502	4.44	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	765/1489	4.44	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 324 0101  
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH  
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 828  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1371/1669	3.87	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1417/1666	3.68	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.02	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	558/1555	4.22	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	659/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1430/1647	3.62	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1648/1668	3.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	3.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1199/1514	4.06	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1189/1506	3.99	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	939/1311	2.17	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	585/1490	4.47	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	393/1502	4.68	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.70	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	959/1006	3.18	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.71	

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

Course Section: ENGL 324 0201  
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH  
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 830  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	5	10	4.11	1103/1669	3.87	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	3	10	3.79	1320/1666	3.68	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	4.50	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	2	10	4.06	999/1617	4.02	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	655/1555	4.22	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	771/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1043/1647	3.62	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	3.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	1166/1514	4.06	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.88	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	3	10	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	2	11	4.11	1017/1506	3.99	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.17	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	356/1490	4.47	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	613/1502	4.68	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	0	2	12	4.35	846/1489	4.70	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	3	1	4	9	4.12	453/1006	3.18	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.12	

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	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 326 0101  
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 831  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	419/1669	4.64	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	385/1666	4.64	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	417/1421	4.64	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	750/1617	4.31	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1037/1555	3.79	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	700/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	617/1647	4.43	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	857/1605	4.09	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	537/1514	4.69	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	409/1551	4.92	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	896/1503	4.23	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	433/1506	4.69	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	206/1490	4.82	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	326/1502	4.82	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	368/1489	4.82	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 340 0101  
 Title MAJOR LITERARY TRADITI  
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 832  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	356/1421	4.70	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1543	4.78	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	653/1503	4.44	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	705/1502	4.44	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006	4.80	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.80	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 364 0101  
 Title PERSPECT ON WOMEN IN L  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 834  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	1173/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1192/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	901/1421	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	875/1617	4.05	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	5	8	4.06	734/1555	4.11	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	895/1543	3.97	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	1043/1647	3.71	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1248/1668	4.36	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1074/1605	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1277/1514	4.01	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1304/1551	4.44	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1315/1503	3.90	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1236/1506	3.95	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	786/1490	4.18	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	880/1502	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	827/1489	4.23	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	779/1006	3.40	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.46	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 14	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 16 Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 371 0101  
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 836  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	966/1666	4.18	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	253/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	622/1555	4.18	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	104/1543	4.91	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	334/1647	4.64	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1425/1668	4.18	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	647/1514	4.63	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	438/1503	4.63	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	799/1506	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	669/1006	3.71	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.71	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

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

Course Section: ENGL 373 0101  
 Title: CREATIVE WRITING-POETR  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 837  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1320/1669	3.86	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	628/1543	4.29	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1205/1647	3.86	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1225/1506	3.80	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.40	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 379 0101  
 Title PRINS/PRACT IN TECH CO  
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 838  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	0	2	3.38	1532/1669	3.38	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	5	0	3.13	1565/1666	3.13	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1464/1617	3.29	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1236/1543	3.57	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1223/1647	3.83	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	1.75	1667/1668	1.75	4.49	4.67	4.68	1.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.92	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1418/1514	3.33	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1380/1503	3.33	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1209/1506	3.83	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	4.43	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	424/1006	4.17	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.17	

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 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 8 Non-major 3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 380 0101  
 Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING  
 Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 841  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1313/1669	3.87	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1059/1666	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1257/1555	3.47	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	195/1543	4.73	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	788/1668	4.87	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	763/1514	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.93	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1506	4.73	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	1	0	1	7	3.91	699/1311	3.91	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1073/1490	3.69	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	772/1502	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	422/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	902/1006	3.17	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 387 0101  
 Title Web Content Develop  
 Instructor: Komlodi, A  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 6  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1094/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	142/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1440/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1357/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1111/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	719/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	770/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	219/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1088/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 391 0201  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 842  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1480/1669	3.61	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1484/1666	3.59	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	0	4	4	3.50	1222/1421	3.43	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1168/1617	3.86	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	2	3	1	2.75	1490/1555	3.08	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1130/1543	3.93	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.65	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1138/1668	4.47	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1490/1605	3.26	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1334/1514	4.09	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1250/1503	3.91	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1288/1506	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1260/1311	2.25	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	2	3	3.22	1278/1490	2.97	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1357/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	753/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	

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	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	9	
?	0			

Course Section: ENGL 391 0401  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 843  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1383/1669	3.61	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	1348/1666	3.59	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1286/1421	3.43	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1218/1617	3.86	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1303/1555	3.08	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	838/1543	3.93	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1178/1647	3.65	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	1305/1668	4.47	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.26	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	877/1514	4.09	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	1231/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1020/1503	3.91	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	958/1506	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	2.25	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	1412/1490	2.97	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	938/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	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 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 3
84-150	1	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 10	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 392 0201  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 844  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	590/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	4.75	3.26	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0301  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 845  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	481/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 392 0401  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 847  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	759/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0501  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 849  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	816/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1068/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	4.75	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0601  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 853  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1022/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 55	4.50	4.19	4.34	4.03	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 46	4.50	4.19	4.45	4.13	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	19/ 33	4.00	4.08	4.25	3.00	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 29	4.00	4.15	4.34	4.13	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0701  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 854  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1596/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1448/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1195/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1501/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1423/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1403/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1	Graduate	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	Other	3
			I 0		
			? 1		

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0801  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 856  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1069/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	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	2	Non-major	1
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	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 392 0901  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 858  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1466/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	969/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1301/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1645/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1274/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.67	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 2		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HENDRICKS, TED  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 859  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1359/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	472/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	121/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	207/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	715/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	6	6	4.07	850/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1043/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	570/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	9	0	3.73	1233/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	861/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	862/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	835/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	1038/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	939/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1404/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	880/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	920/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	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 10	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HENDRICKS, TED  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 860  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1395/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	1094/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	356/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	750/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	773/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	771/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	549/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	4	1	2	3	3.40	1400/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1094/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	1319/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	896/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1069/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	426/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	849/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	567/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	776/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 861  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	5	5	4	3.39	1530/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	5	3.89	1250/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	1112/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1148/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	747/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	4	10	4.18	940/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1164/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	6	7	2	3.33	1418/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	973/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	7	5	4	3.50	1330/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	1	8	3.71	1262/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	846/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1314/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	975/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	936/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

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 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0401  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 862  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	0	3.25	1563/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	1334/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1189/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	7	5	3.75	1251/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	3	4	0	2.67	1505/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	857/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1310/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	10	6	0	3.38	1642/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	3.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	8	0	3.46	1374/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	1248/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	1384/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	996/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	5	3.81	1219/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	439/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1434/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1462/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	956/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 15
84-150	7	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 12	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0701  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 863  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	8	4	3.43	1516/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	13	4.43	662/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	710/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	335/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1227/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	723/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	3	8	3.75	1275/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	1	4.05	1503/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	10	2	3.81	1164/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	715/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	1216/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	686/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	1	12	3.95	1121/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	333/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	849/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	950/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	532/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		21
			I 0		Non-major
			? 0		21
					18

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

Course Section: ENGL 393 0801  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: MEADE, VICKI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 864  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1138/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1065/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	557/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1326/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	759/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	583/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1190/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	12	1	3.93	1039/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	908/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	870/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	901/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	0	5	6	3.86	731/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1055/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1013/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	742/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	607/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 1001  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 866  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	1173/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	4	10	4.12	1028/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	916/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	801/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	2	3	3.07	1418/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	1035/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	2	12	4.24	885/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1132/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	939/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	760/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	556/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	1042/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	665/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	2	2	4	3.25	1265/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	0	10	4.31	846/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	1015/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	479/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	

Course Section: ENGL 393 1001  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 866  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 393 1101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 867  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	2	5	2	1	2.47	1651/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	2.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1563/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1393/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	2	4	2	1	2.43	1530/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	1195/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	851/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	1	3	5	1	2.73	1481/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	2.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	1111/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	6	3	1	2.87	1440/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	2	2	2.73	1438/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	5	2	2	2	2.77	1193/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1389/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	950/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1146/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	873/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 1201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 868  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1339/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	975/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	557/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	821/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1257/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	618/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	389/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	750/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	918/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	647/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	880/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	941/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1042/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	483/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1338/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	3	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 14	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 8020  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 869  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1326/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1474/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1304/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	838/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	865/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	967/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 393E 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 870  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	938/1669	4.57	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	483/1666	4.73	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	789/1421	4.57	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	760/1617	4.55	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	477/1555	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	371/1543	4.71	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	817/1647	4.59	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1431/1668	4.31	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.60	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	799/1514	4.70	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	1284/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	823/1503	4.61	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	642/1506	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	373/1311	4.57	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.86	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	292/1006	4.71	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ENGL 393E 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 870  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 393E 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 871  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1669	4.57	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	103/1666	4.73	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.57	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	161/1617	4.55	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	207/1555	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	104/1543	4.71	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.59	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1240/1668	4.31	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.60	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.70	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1503	4.61	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	131/1311	4.57	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	4.86	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	4.71	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ENGL 393E 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 871  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 394 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL EDITING  
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 872  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1657/1669	2.40	4.04	4.23	4.28	2.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1641/1666	2.40	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1569/1617	2.80	4.25	4.15	4.22	2.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1358/1543	3.20	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	2.00	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1561/1605	2.50	4.10	4.07	4.09	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1510/1514	1.80	4.30	4.39	4.46	1.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1361/1551	4.20	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	1483/1503	2.20	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1486/1506	2.20	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	1245/1311	2.40	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1431/1490	2.50	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1301/1502	3.50	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1361/1489	3.25	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.25	

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

Course Section: ENGL 395 0101  
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 873  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	2	1	2.83	1604/1666	2.83	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	4	1	2.92	1548/1617	2.92	4.25	4.15	4.22	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	2	2	2.83	1478/1555	2.83	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	4	0	2.75	1488/1543	2.75	4.31	4.06	4.14	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	3	0	2.17	1615/1647	2.17	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.78	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	4	1	3.25	1431/1514	3.27	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	1404/1551	4.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1452/1503	2.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	3	2	0	2.25	1482/1506	2.27	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	1293/1311	1.20	3.26	3.85	3.97	1.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1242/1490	3.30	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1179/1502	3.80	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1237/1489	3.60	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	946/1006	2.89	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.29	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	40/ 52	3.29	4.19	4.06	3.59	3.29	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	30/ 39	3.80	4.29	4.39	3.82	3.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	31/ 40	3.20	4.17	3.97	3.34	3.20	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 395 0101  
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 874  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	2	1	2.83	1604/1666	2.83	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	4	1	2.92	1548/1617	2.92	4.25	4.15	4.22	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	2	2	2.83	1478/1555	2.83	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	4	0	2.75	1488/1543	2.75	4.31	4.06	4.14	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	3	0	2.17	1615/1647	2.17	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1428/1605	3.78	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1426/1514	3.27	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1404/1551	4.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	0	3	0	2.71	1455/1503	2.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	4	1	1	0	2.29	1480/1506	2.27	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	1.20	3.26	3.85	3.97	1.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1242/1490	3.30	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1179/1502	3.80	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1237/1489	3.60	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	946/1006	2.89	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.29	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	40/ 52	3.29	4.19	4.06	3.59	3.29	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	30/ 39	3.80	4.29	4.39	3.82	3.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	31/ 40	3.20	4.17	3.97	3.34	3.20	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 401 0101  
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI  
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 876  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.75	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.66	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	255/1421	4.70	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555	4.73	3.96	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1543	4.50	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	759/1647	4.28	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1605	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.86	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	438/1503	4.54	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.67	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.85	3.26	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	445/1490	4.43	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	393/1502	4.56	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	434/1489	4.47	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	4.29	3.89	4.00	4.21	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 401 0201  
 Title: METHOD OF INTERPRETATI  
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 877  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	463/1669	4.75	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	516/1666	4.66	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	453/1421	4.70	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	568/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	379/1555	4.73	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	680/1543	4.50	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	885/1647	4.28	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.70	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	591/1605	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.86	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	862/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	621/1503	4.54	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	10	4.46	693/1506	4.67	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	738/1311	3.85	3.26	3.85	3.88	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	594/1490	4.43	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	790/1502	4.56	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	960/1489	4.47	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	735/1006	4.29	3.89	4.00	4.21	3.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 405B 0101  
 Title THE RENAISSANCE  
 Instructor: ORLIN, LENA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 878  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	100/1555	4.90	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	142/1543	4.80	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.49	4.67	4.70	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.70	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.70	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	904/1311	3.57	3.26	3.85	3.88	3.57	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	344/1006	4.33	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 407 0101  
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY  
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 879  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	1124/1669	4.08	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	534/1543	4.38	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1223/1647	3.83	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	10	1	3.85	1601/1668	3.85	4.49	4.67	4.70	3.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	871/1605	4.08	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1136/1514	4.17	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1265/1503	3.69	4.25	4.24	4.27	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1153/1506	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.29	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.26	3.85	3.88	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	400/1490	4.58	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	772/1502	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	424/1006	4.17	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 410 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN GENRE STUDI  
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 880  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.81	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	70/1555	4.94	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	138/1543	4.81	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	185/1647	4.79	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.49	4.67	4.70	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	132/1514	4.93	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.25	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	115/1506	4.93	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	113/1490	4.93	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	224/1489	4.93	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1006	4.83	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	3.86	****	

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 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 486 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 881  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	175/1669	4.85	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	319/1666	4.69	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	165/1555	4.77	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	226/1543	4.69	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	1007/1647	4.08	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1605	4.83	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1503	4.90	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1490	4.92	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	328/1006	4.36	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	3.86	****	

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	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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: ENGL 490 0101  
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ENGL LAN  
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 882  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	231/1669	4.79	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	789/1421	4.29	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	285/1555	4.57	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	562/1543	4.36	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	350/1605	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.85	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	528/1503	4.54	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	340/1506	4.77	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	365/1311	4.36	3.26	3.85	3.88	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	292/1006	4.43	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.43	

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 5		Graduate 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	4	
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		8
			? 0			