

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 652
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	461/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	574/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	788/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	863/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	435/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	405/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	827/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	756/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	630/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	708/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	148/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	296/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	308/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.21	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 653
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	7	4	3	2.91	1470/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	2.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	11	3	2	2.91	1443/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	2.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	5	4	3	2.86	1209/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	2.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	7	6	2	3.10	1353/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	3.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	8	6	4	3.32	1176/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	7	3	5	3.09	1257/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	4	5	6	3	3.10	1370/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	19	0	3.90	1420/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	7	4	2	3.25	1307/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	8	1	5	3.21	1342/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	1130/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	9	3	4	3.32	1282/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	3	5	4	4	3.28	1279/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	4	4	6	2	3.11	1035/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	2	6	4	1	2.76	1194/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	2.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	5	1	3	3	5	3.12	1157/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	3.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	3	4	4	3.25	1145/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	1	3	5	0	3.00	713/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 654
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	918/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	458/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	624/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	416/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	2	6	5	3.30	1181/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	290/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	611/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1178/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	189/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	417/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	300/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	567/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	9	9	4.20	913/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	661/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	345/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	358/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	357/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	176/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 655
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	587/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	617/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	357/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	310/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	93/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	264/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	436/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	203/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	574/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	250/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	502/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	433/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	124/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	264/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	13	4.60	509/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	382/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	533/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 8	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 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 656
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	957/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	1070/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	893/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	908/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	2	5	8	3.89	808/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	444/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	6	4	3	3.11	1369/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	10	1	3.71	1142/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	1122/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	636/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1002/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	898/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	573/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	897/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	895/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	843/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	3	2	6	1	3.23	693/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.23	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 11			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 657
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1265/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	934/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	810/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	485/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	950/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	474/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	827/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	3.93	1398/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1089/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1321/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	1211/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1120/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1190/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	4	1	0	2	2.56	1218/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	2.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1113/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	901/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	779/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	2.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 658
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	1	5	1	3.00	1451/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	1397/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1081/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	1	2	3	3.20	1343/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	1	5	3.36	1154/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	1	4	3.27	1202/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1309/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	1437/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	997/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1385/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	2.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1354/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1277/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1283/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	887/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1043/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	774/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	2.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 659
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	4	7	3.67	1299/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	7	5	3.57	1296/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	852/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	7	1	4	4	2.85	1334/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	2.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	9	3.86	920/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	6	4	2	4	2.71	1416/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	2.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	702/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	2	6	8	3	3.38	1272/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	3	8	3	3.20	1344/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	930/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	6	7	3	3.35	1272/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	6	2	7	3.45	1243/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1114/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	797/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	391/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	486/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 6	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	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 4	
			? 3		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 660
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1031/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	661/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	334/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	6	3	3.40	1136/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	283/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	425/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1072/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	651/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	633/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	846/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	829/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	877/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	708/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	636/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	291/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 661
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	780/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	661/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	533/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	5	6	4	3.61	1018/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	270/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	8	10	4.30	732/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	15	4	4.15	1288/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	375/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	417/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	500/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	390/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	433/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	397/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	467/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	489/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	357/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	308/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.21	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 662
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1351/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	979/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	718/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	818/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	998/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	755/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	3	7	3.94	1013/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	4	12	1	0	2.82	1477/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	2.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	836/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1281/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1221/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1170/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	1067/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	507/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	588/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	669/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	394/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 662
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 663
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1265/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	399/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	470/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	874/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	10	1	3.85	846/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	283/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	298/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	1089/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	514/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	1084/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	613/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	6	5	4.00	1017/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	457/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	913/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	821/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	809/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	659/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 664
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	870/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	493/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	545/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	297/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	251/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	505/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1185/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	334/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	400/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	545/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	256/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	766/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	283/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	381/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	509/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	296/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	176/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 665
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	12	3	4.00	1069/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	386/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	416/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1276/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	527/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	854/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	2	4.11	1316/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	375/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	304/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	195/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	571/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	5	0	1	1	0	1.71	1174/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	1.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	563/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	304/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	151/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	318/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors		13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	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: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 666
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1380/1481	3.87	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1420/1481	4.05	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	4	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1123/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.06	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.65	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	920/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1360/1459	3.92	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.30	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1270/1409	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1354/1407	4.58	4.68	4.69	4.57	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1196/1399	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1312/1400	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1179	3.68	3.87	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1223/1262	3.83	4.28	4.05	3.77	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1221/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1200/1256	4.35	4.56	4.30	4.08	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	3.66	3.97	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 667
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	718/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	493/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	810/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	364/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	121/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	384/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	809/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	259/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	865/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	522/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	819/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	397/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1027/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	249/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	451/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	264/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	631/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 668
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1426/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1142/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	988/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1197/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1276/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	649/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	460/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	973/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1228/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1053/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	1120/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	1140/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1104/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1070/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	751/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	860/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	254/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	1	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 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 669
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	7	6	5	3.39	1389/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	8	4.00	1000/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1096/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	4	9	7	4.00	959/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	4	5	5	4	3.05	1284/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	731/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	12	4.22	809/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	7	5	3	3.63	1179/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	739/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	880/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	683/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	8	4.10	985/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	850/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1070/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	6	3	3	3.54	1089/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	3.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1061/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	659/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	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	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 670
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	6	7	3.90	1162/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	560/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	7	4	4	4.25	742/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	740/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	649/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	474/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	940/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	15	2	2	3.14	1464/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	515/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	762/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	728/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	513/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	541/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	2	4	0	3	3.44	924/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	624/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	715/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	477/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	347/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 8	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 671
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	6	7	3.90	1162/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	560/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	742/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	740/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	649/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	474/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	940/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	15	2	2	3.14	1464/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	3.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	836/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	624/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	715/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	477/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	347/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 8	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 672
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	4	9	3.85	1193/1481	3.77	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	458/1481	4.32	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	893/1249	4.03	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	896/1424	4.15	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	10	3.85	839/1396	3.83	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	5	10	4.05	725/1342	4.22	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	732/1459	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.21	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1189/1450	4.02	4.15	4.09	3.97	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	618/1409	4.39	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	804/1407	4.75	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	545/1399	4.32	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	929/1400	4.26	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	549/1179	3.42	3.87	3.96	3.85	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	325/1262	4.03	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	480/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	760/1256	4.37	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	159/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	3.80	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 672
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 673
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1315/1481	3.94	4.16	4.29	4.14	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	693/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	810/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	885/1424	4.06	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1011/1396	3.88	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	987/1342	3.94	4.34	4.07	3.88	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1154/1459	4.06	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	836/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1110/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1200/1407	4.31	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	713/1399	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	741/1400	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	739/1179	3.77	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	949/1262	3.81	4.28	4.05	3.77	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	895/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	848/1256	4.21	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	713/ 788	3.25	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	2.50	2.50	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 249	3.00	3.00	4.11	3.95	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	2.00	2.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	3.00	3.32	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	3.00	3.56	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 673
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0102
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 674
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	844/1481	3.94	4.16	4.29	4.14	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	893/1249	4.08	4.31	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	959/1424	4.06	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	623/1396	3.88	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	672/1342	3.94	4.34	4.07	3.88	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.06	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.44	4.68	4.64	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.08	4.15	4.09	3.97	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1110/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.36	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1257/1407	4.31	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	828/1399	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	969/1400	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.19	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	820/1179	3.77	3.87	3.96	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	708/1262	3.81	4.28	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1259	4.21	4.53	4.29	4.06	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	754/1256	4.21	4.56	4.30	4.08	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.25	3.97	4.00	3.80	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	246/ 246	2.50	2.50	4.20	3.93	2.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.00	4.11	3.95	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	240/ 242	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.33	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	199/ 240	3.50	3.50	4.20	4.20	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	59/ 59	2.00	2.00	4.30	4.00	2.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	47/ 51	2.00	2.00	4.00	3.44	2.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	50/ 55	3.00	3.32	4.55	4.48	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	31/ 31	3.00	3.56	4.75	4.42	3.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0102
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 674
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 210A 0101
 Title INTRO TO LITERATURE
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, VI
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 675
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1006/1481	4.11	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	361/1481	4.63	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	655/1249	4.37	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	762/1424	4.24	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	177/1396	4.68	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	5	8	3.89	898/1342	3.89	4.34	4.07	4.05	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	310/1459	4.63	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	367/1409	4.79	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	300/1407	4.95	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	545/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	456/1400	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	4	4	2	6	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.87	3.96	4.05	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	788/1262	3.92	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	556/1259	4.55	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 210B 0101
 Title INTRO TO LITERATURE
 Instructor: KENDALL, GEORGE
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 676
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	16	16	4.10	1006/1481	4.10	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	15	22	4.37	704/1481	4.37	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	15	21	4.38	647/1249	4.38	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	3	0	3	14	18	4.16	852/1424	4.16	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	10	25	4.51	291/1396	4.51	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	9	11	18	4.18	615/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	6	28	4.55	402/1459	4.55	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	27	11	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	2	1	12	19	4.41	459/1450	4.41	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	11	25	4.49	787/1409	4.49	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	6	32	4.77	804/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	9	25	4.49	590/1399	4.49	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	10	26	4.51	581/1400	4.51	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	23	4	5	2	1	5	2.88	1089/1179	2.88	3.87	3.96	4.05	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	310/1262	4.57	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	8	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 41 Non-major 41
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101
 Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 677
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	469/1481	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	12	4.37	693/1481	4.37	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	414/1249	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	5	11	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.33	4.21	4.28	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	10	5	11	3.96	744/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.94	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	10	7	6	3.48	1125/1342	3.48	4.34	4.07	4.05	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	5	16	4.37	647/1459	4.37	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	959/1480	4.65	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	13	6	4.09	792/1450	4.09	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	659/1409	4.59	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	11	11	4.22	855/1399	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	541/1400	4.56	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	860/1179	3.60	3.87	3.96	4.05	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	5	3	10	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	754/1256	4.29	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	15	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	3.98	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	5	3	6	3.65	49/ 55	3.65	3.32	4.55	4.44	3.65	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	27/ 31	4.13	3.56	4.75	4.50	4.13	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	42/ 51	4.31	4.31	4.65	4.66	4.31	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	9	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	31/ 34	4.14	4.14	4.83	4.43	4.14	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	11	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 678
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	385/1424	4.55	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	257/1396	4.57	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	505/1459	4.48	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	1126/1480	4.38	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	808/1450	4.06	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	636/1399	4.45	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.05	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	391/1262	4.45	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	391/1259	4.73	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	486/1256	4.64	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	4.58	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 678
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 679
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	626/1481	4.47	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	458/1481	4.41	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	393/1249	4.44	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	717/1424	4.25	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	126/1396	4.73	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	725/1342	4.12	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	899/1459	4.10	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.44	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	620/1450	4.25	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	500/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	682/1407	4.84	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	545/1399	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	299/1400	4.62	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	3	0	7	5	3.93	661/1179	4.13	3.87	3.96	4.05	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	305/1262	4.32	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	524/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	548/ 788	4.06	3.97	4.00	3.98	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	11
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0201
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 680
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	549/1481	4.47	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	801/1481	4.41	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	726/1249	4.44	4.31	4.27	4.36	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	773/1424	4.25	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	177/1396	4.73	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	7	12	4.18	603/1342	4.12	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	6	9	4.09	914/1459	4.10	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	702/1480	4.95	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	651/1450	4.25	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	559/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	614/1407	4.84	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	491/1399	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	624/1400	4.62	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	4	1	12	4.33	384/1179	4.13	3.87	3.96	4.05	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	687/1262	4.32	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	432/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	218/ 788	4.06	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.40	

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	4	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101
 Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 681
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	959/1481	4.11	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	416/1424	4.53	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	285/1396	4.53	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	257/1342	4.58	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	1	10	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1336/1480	4.05	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1068/1409	4.20	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	683/1399	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	249/1262	4.70	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1259	4.70	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	304/ 788	4.22	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 6	Under-grad 21 Non-major 18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	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 9	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 682
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	450/1481	4.62	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	481/1481	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1249	3.75	4.31	4.27	4.36	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	406/1424	4.54	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	459/1396	4.31	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1029/1480	4.54	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	190/1259	4.92	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	495/ 788	3.88	3.97	4.00	3.98	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
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 291 0101
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 683
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	487/1481	3.62	4.16	4.29	4.40	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	917/1481	3.39	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	318/1424	3.79	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	233/1396	3.30	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	130/1342	4.23	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	1063/1459	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1044/1480	4.05	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	662/1450	3.53	4.15	4.09	4.15	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1098/1409	3.39	4.29	4.42	4.47	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	350/1407	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	683/1399	3.38	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	704/1400	3.31	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	274/1262	3.95	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	257/1259	4.20	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	320/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	176/ 788	4.31	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.43	****	

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	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 19	Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 684
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	0	6	3	3	2.94	1462/1481	3.62	4.16	4.29	4.40	2.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	0	9	1	1	2.47	1471/1481	3.39	4.23	4.23	4.29	2.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	1	3	5	1	2.73	1402/1424	3.79	4.33	4.21	4.28	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	1	5	3	1	2.41	1375/1396	3.30	4.05	3.98	3.94	2.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	1	4	8	3.71	1018/1342	4.23	4.34	4.07	4.05	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	8	2	4	1	1	2.06	1437/1459	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	2.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	966/1480	4.05	4.44	4.68	4.68	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	1	6	4	0	2.67	1417/1450	3.53	4.15	4.09	4.15	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	5	4	1	1	2	2.31	1402/1409	3.39	4.29	4.42	4.47	2.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	1019/1407	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	3	3	2	1	2.46	1384/1399	3.38	4.28	4.26	4.29	2.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	3	3	1	2.54	1361/1400	3.31	4.23	4.27	4.34	2.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	5	4	3.54	983/1262	3.95	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	3	1	1	8	4.08	875/1259	4.20	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	901/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	358/ 788	4.31	3.97	4.00	3.98	4.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 685
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	1	3.33	1407/1481	3.62	4.16	4.29	4.40	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1303/1481	3.39	4.23	4.23	4.29	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	959/1424	3.79	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1331/1396	3.30	4.05	3.98	3.94	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	565/1342	4.23	4.34	4.07	4.05	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1236/1459	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1469/1480	4.05	4.44	4.68	4.68	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1450	3.53	4.15	4.09	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1261/1409	3.39	4.29	4.42	4.47	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1296/1407	4.52	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1288/1399	3.38	4.28	4.26	4.29	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1312/1400	3.31	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	931/1262	3.95	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1067/1259	4.20	4.53	4.29	4.34	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1069/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.28	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.31	3.97	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 686
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	976/1481	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	481/1481	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	548/1249	4.49	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	645/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	330/1396	4.62	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	405/1342	4.42	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	2	6	3.87	1078/1459	4.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1260/1480	4.71	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	692/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	534/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	385/1400	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	870/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	507/1262	4.39	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	588/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	571/1256	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	176/ 788	3.99	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.50	

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	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	2	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0201
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 687
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	587/1481	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	434/1481	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	573/1249	4.49	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	310/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	177/1396	4.62	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	494/1342	4.42	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	766/1459	4.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.71	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	567/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	852/1409	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	705/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	567/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	591/1400	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1011/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	228/1262	4.39	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	229/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	272/1256	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	501/ 788	3.99	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 19 Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 688
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	729/1481	4.32	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	682/1481	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	432/1249	4.49	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	385/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	151/1396	4.62	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	270/1342	4.42	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	635/1459	4.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.71	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	588/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	466/1409	4.57	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	376/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	511/1400	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	541/1179	3.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	659/1262	4.39	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	572/1259	4.64	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	698/1256	4.57	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	4	7	3	3.63	577/ 788	3.99	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.63	

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	5	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 689
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	1	8	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	923/1424	4.08	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	363/1396	4.43	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1337/1459	3.25	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	7	3	3	3.57	1450/1480	3.57	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	786/1450	4.09	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1259	4.70	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	526/ 788	3.78	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 14 Non-major 5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 690
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1481	4.92	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	65/1396	4.93	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	206/1342	4.64	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	224/1459	4.71	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1100/1480	4.43	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	135/1450	4.82	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	588/1409	4.64	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	208/1400	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	381/1262	4.46	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	751/1259	4.31	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	785/1256	4.23	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.36	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.43	****	

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	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	2	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101
 Title BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 691
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	505/1481	4.55	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	374/1481	4.62	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	423/1249	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	18	4.41	545/1424	4.41	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	22	4.68	185/1396	4.68	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	343/1342	4.46	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	367/1459	4.59	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	536/1450	4.35	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	275/1409	4.85	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	200/1407	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	335/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	250/1400	4.81	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	3	1	4	1	6	3.40	945/1179	3.40	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	244/1262	4.71	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	314/1259	4.79	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO
 Instructor: Fernandez, Jean
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 692
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	4	15	4.48	587/1481	4.48	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	715/1481	4.35	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	357/1249	4.65	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	416/1424	4.52	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	241/1396	4.60	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	671/1459	4.35	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	1146/1480	4.35	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	417/1450	4.44	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1409	****	4.29	4.42	4.43	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1407	****	4.68	4.69	4.67	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1399	****	4.28	4.26	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1400	****	4.23	4.27	4.28	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	1	13	4.28	556/1262	4.28	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	336/1259	4.78	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1256	4.72	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	4	2	2	1	3	2.75	742/ 788	2.75	3.97	4.00	4.07	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101
 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 693
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	17	4.54	513/1481	4.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	17	4.54	469/1481	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	196/1249	4.82	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	395/1424	4.54	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	217/1396	4.64	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	214/1342	4.64	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	350/1409	4.79	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	322/1399	4.71	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	18	4.63	468/1400	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	2	6	11	3.96	641/1179	3.96	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	17	4.48	372/1262	4.48	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	285/1259	4.83	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	382/1256	4.74	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	249/ 788	4.35	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.35	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 24 Non-major 6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101
 Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 694
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	364/1424	4.58	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	87/1396	4.89	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	520/1459	4.46	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	770/1480	4.85	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	10	11	4.21	683/1450	4.21	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	217/1409	4.88	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	212/1399	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	20	4.65	433/1400	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	299/1179	4.46	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	154/1262	4.83	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	489/1259	4.63	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	240/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	3	2	2	4	7	3.56	594/ 788	3.56	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0						
						Other	24				

Course-Section: ENGL 312 0101
 Title TOPICS IN FICTION
 Instructor: GLADSTONE, JASO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 695
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	1162/1481	3.91	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	334/1424	4.60	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	111/1396	4.80	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	238/1342	4.60	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1139/1480	4.36	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	692/1450	4.20	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1200/1407	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	236/1262	4.71	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
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 316 0101
 Title LITERATURE & OTHER ART
 Instructor: NEWMAN-SAUL, EL
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 696
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	1	6	3.50	1358/1481	3.50	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1438/1481	2.93	4.23	4.23	4.23	2.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1111/1249	3.54	4.31	4.27	4.28	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	1	6	3	3.36	1311/1424	3.36	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	3	1	2.69	1350/1396	2.69	4.05	3.98	4.00	2.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	2	3	3.29	1200/1342	3.29	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	3	1	3	2.79	1413/1459	2.79	4.05	4.16	4.17	2.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1331/1480	4.07	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1343/1450	3.10	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1283/1409	3.58	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	4	1	4	3.45	1248/1399	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1253/1400	3.42	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	70/1179	4.92	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	2	3	3.36	1052/1262	3.36	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	872/1256	4.07	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	746/ 788	2.69	3.97	4.00	4.07	2.69	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 697
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	2	6	8	3.84	1154/1481	3.84	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	896/1424	4.12	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	451/1396	4.32	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	6	7	3.84	927/1342	3.84	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	6	1	5	3.17	1356/1459	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	2	1	3	9	3.88	989/1450	3.88	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	1	7	6	4.06	1134/1409	4.06	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	919/1407	4.71	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	956/1399	4.12	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	1095/1400	3.88	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	197/1179	4.63	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	315/1262	4.56	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	432/1259	4.69	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	288/1256	4.81	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	459/ 788	3.93	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 698
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	698/1481	4.39	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	801/1481	4.28	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	671/1424	4.31	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	151/1396	4.72	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	2	10	3	3.72	1442/1480	3.72	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1098/1409	4.14	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	766/1407	4.79	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	929/1399	4.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	2	9	4.14	953/1400	4.14	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	320/1262	4.56	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	548/1259	4.56	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 348 0101
 Title LITERATURE AND CULTURE
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 699
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	487/1481	4.57	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	386/1481	4.62	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	263/1424	4.69	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	131/1396	4.77	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	230/1342	4.62	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	189/1459	4.77	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1126/1480	4.38	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	249/1262	4.69	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	169/1259	4.92	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1256	4.92	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	428/1481	4.64	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	469/1481	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	393/1249	4.61	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	395/1424	4.55	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	151/1396	4.73	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	603/1342	4.18	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	413/1459	4.55	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	974/1480	4.64	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	289/1450	4.56	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	739/1409	4.53	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	545/1407	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	480/1399	4.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	692/1400	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	92/1179	4.88	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	347/1259	4.76	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	2	7	5	4	3.35	665/ 788	3.35	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.35	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.88	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D 0	Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 19

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 369 0101
 Title RACE RELATIONS/AMER LI
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 701
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	626/1481	4.44	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	311/1481	4.68	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	279/1424	4.68	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	156/1396	4.72	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	18	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	611/1459	4.40	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	609/1450	4.27	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	217/1409	4.88	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	178/1399	4.84	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	115/1179	4.79	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	162/1262	4.82	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	248/1259	4.86	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	216/1256	4.91	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	540/ 788	3.73	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 16	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	13
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	25
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 371 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI
 Instructor: Oliver, Laura
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 702
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	497/1424	4.45	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	338/1396	4.45	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	251/1342	4.58	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.42	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	196/1450	4.70	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	826/1409	4.45	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	705/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	523/1399	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	287/1400	4.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	320/1262	4.56	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 703
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	1435/1481	3.14	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1118/1249	3.50	4.31	4.27	4.28	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1424	****	4.33	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	1358/1396	2.60	4.05	3.98	4.00	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.05	4.16	4.17	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1295/1480	4.14	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1391/1409	2.67	4.29	4.42	4.43	2.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1221/1407	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1371/1399	2.67	4.28	4.26	4.27	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1312/1400	3.00	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1108/1262	3.17	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	836/1259	4.17	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101
 Title FEATURE WRITING
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 704
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	188/1481	4.87	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	136/1396	4.75	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	60/1342	4.94	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1029/1480	4.53	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	252/1450	4.62	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	116/1399	4.92	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	131/1400	4.92	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	228/1262	4.73	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	294/1259	4.82	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1256	4.82	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 17 Non-major 12
84-150	5	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 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 383 0101
 Title SCIENCE WRITING
 Instructor: Fitzgerald, Wil
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 705
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	4	6	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.33	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	5	2	3.53	1309/1481	3.53	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1242/1424	3.60	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	3	3	3.27	1195/1396	3.27	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1071/1342	3.60	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1021/1459	3.93	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	7	5	1	3.33	1462/1480	3.33	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	7	4	2	3.50	1293/1409	3.50	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1211/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	2	3	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	5	3	3.43	1250/1400	3.43	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	949/1262	3.63	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	992/1259	3.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.07	****	

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	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101
 Title WEB CONTENT DEVELOPMEN
 Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 706
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.33	

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

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0101
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 707
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	292/1481	4.24	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	517/1481	4.18	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1280/1396	3.49	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	60/1342	4.71	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	647/1459	3.77	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.78	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	546/1450	4.23	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	946/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	404/1399	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	681/1400	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1179	2.75	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	289/1262	4.31	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	169/1259	4.74	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1256	4.73	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	85/ 788	4.53	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.83	

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	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 708
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	1006/1481	4.24	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	822/1481	4.18	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	620/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	959/1396	3.49	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	333/1342	4.71	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	2	10	3	3.58	1236/1459	3.77	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	770/1480	4.78	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	771/1450	4.23	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1092/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	930/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	10	7	4.10	966/1399	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	4	9	3.85	1104/1400	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1104/1179	2.75	3.87	3.96	4.02	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	4	8	3.94	761/1262	4.31	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	615/1259	4.74	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	560/1256	4.73	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	291/ 788	4.53	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 10
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 709
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1193/1481	4.24	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1189/1481	4.18	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	620/1424	4.51	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.36		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	950/1396	3.49	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	153/1342	4.71	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	2	3	3.36	1312/1459	3.77	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1044/1480	4.78	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	630/1450	4.23	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1222/1409	4.13	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	785/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1156/1399	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1217/1400	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1179	2.75	3.87	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	477/1262	4.31	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	294/1259	4.74	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1256	4.73	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	176/ 788	4.53	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
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	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 710
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1358/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1193/1249	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.28	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	959/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	4.25	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	755/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1256/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1293/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1296/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1237/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1230/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1041/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	901/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0201
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 711
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	4.25	4.05	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	961/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 712
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 713
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	4.25	4.05	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0501
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 714
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	287/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	961/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 715
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396	4.25	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1158/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	4.50	3.87	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 716
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	4.80	3.97	4.00	4.07	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	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1001
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 717
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	4.68	4.16	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.23	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.27	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.34	4.07	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	961/1459	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.44	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	4.77	4.15	4.09	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	4.69	4.29	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	4.69	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.28	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	4.88	4.53	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	4.88	4.56	4.30	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 718
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1299/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	1	6	3.93	1094/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	893/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	923/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	4	2	3.27	1195/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	912/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1318/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	839/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1081/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1134/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	1253/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1067/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1104/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	894/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	1059/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	861/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	723/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	763/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	3.00	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****	

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 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	3	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		
			? 0	Other	10

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 719
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1324/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1118/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	885/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1071/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1201/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1469/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	2	0	3.11	1340/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1311/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1294/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1217/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1230/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1148/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	958/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1027/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1025/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: KIRKPATRICK, RO
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 720
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	6	5	2	3.05	1446/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	4	1	2.95	1433/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1212/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	6	6	2	3.33	1316/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	5	4	6	1	2.94	1313/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	2.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	9	4	3.63	1055/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	6	3	3	3.00	1380/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	3.89	1421/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	8	1	0	2.75	1406/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	4	6	2	5	3.33	1325/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	9	5	3.94	1312/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	9	3	2	3.17	1308/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	8	4	1	2.94	1325/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	939/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1044/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	895/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	996/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 721
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1212/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	646/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	695/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	4	2	3.12	1266/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	394/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	792/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1034/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	567/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	800/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	1091/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	601/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	6	8	4.06	1001/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	549/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	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	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 722
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1218/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	822/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	645/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	2	4	3.13	1261/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	434/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	647/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	981/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	8	2	3.79	1072/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	559/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	728/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	534/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	704/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	533/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	887/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	783/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	837/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	533/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 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	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 723
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1424/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1253/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1101/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	898/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	1318/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1422/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	968/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1327/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	855/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1095/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	705/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 724
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	1347/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1000/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	874/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1136/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	534/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1086/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1114/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	786/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1104/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1277/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1115/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1067/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	590/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	610/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	509/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	516/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	201/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	4.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.50	4.20	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.13	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	5	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 725
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1334/1481	3.54	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1189/1481	3.86	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	3.93	4.31	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	863/1424	4.04	4.33	4.21	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	858/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	1	2	6	3.50	1256/1459	3.66	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1193/1480	4.18	4.44	4.68	4.65	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1312/1450	3.57	4.15	4.09	4.10	3.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1279/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1350/1407	4.18	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1159/1399	3.95	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	1	6	3.69	1173/1400	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	495/1179	3.69	3.87	3.96	4.02	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1262	3.65	4.28	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1259	4.15	4.53	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1256	4.15	4.56	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	3.64	3.97	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 726
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.16	4.29	4.29	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	1106/1481	3.92	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1152/1424	3.82	4.33	4.21	4.27	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.34	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.05	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1447/1480	3.64	4.44	4.68	4.65	3.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1425/1450	2.56	4.15	4.09	4.10	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	1	6	3.67	1270/1409	3.67	4.29	4.42	4.43	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1334/1407	3.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1086/1399	3.92	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1230/1400	3.50	4.23	4.27	4.28	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	880/1179	3.55	3.87	3.96	4.02	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.43	4.28	4.05	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1259	4.43	4.53	4.29	4.34	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.56	4.30	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.33	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.00	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.33	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.71	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.03	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.31	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.14	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 726
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101
 Title: METHOD OF INTERPRETATI
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 727
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1249	4.72	4.31	4.27	4.44	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	49/1396	4.94	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	125/1342	4.78	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	113/1459	4.89	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	113/1409	4.94	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	195/1399	4.82	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	166/1400	4.89	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	384/1179	4.33	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	134/1262	4.89	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.53	4.29	4.57	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	232/1256	4.89	4.56	4.30	4.60	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	188/ 788	4.47	3.97	4.00	4.26	4.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	2.50	4.20	4.45	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.72	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.64	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	2.00	4.30	4.93	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.32	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.56	4.75	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 17

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 405 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN LITERARY HI
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 728
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.16	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	286/1481	4.70	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	788/1249	4.20	4.31	4.27	4.44	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	82/1396	4.90	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	270/1342	4.56	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	101/1459	4.90	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1260/1480	4.20	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1450	4.88	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	129/1399	4.90	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	3.87	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	146/1262	4.86	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1256	4.71	4.56	4.30	4.60	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.97	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.72	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	34/ 69	4.67	4.75	4.53	4.64	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	28/ 63	4.67	4.33	4.44	4.49	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.53	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	36/ 68	4.00	4.03	3.92	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	7	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	10
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 729
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	362/1481	4.80	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	971/1481	4.41	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	406/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	233/1396	4.77	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	283/1342	4.73	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1256/1459	4.04	4.05	4.16	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	951/1480	4.79	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	792/1450	4.48	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	826/1409	4.64	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	567/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	591/1400	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	464/1179	4.03	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	134/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	133/ 788	4.83	3.97	4.00	4.26	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0201
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 730
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1481	4.80	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	228/1481	4.41	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1424	4.77	4.33	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1396	4.77	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1342	4.73	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	367/1459	4.04	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.79	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1450	4.48	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	319/1409	4.64	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	203/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	146/1400	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	739/1179	4.03	3.87	3.96	4.07	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1262	4.94	4.28	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 788	4.83	3.97	4.00	4.26	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 447 0101
 Title ADV TOP IN LIT & CULTU
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 731
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.16	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.05	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.34	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1399	4.83	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	208/1179	4.60	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.97	4.00	4.26	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.72	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.75	4.53	4.64	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.33	4.44	4.49	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.53	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	23/ 68	4.75	4.03	3.92	4.10	4.75	

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	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
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 471 0101
 Title ADV CREATIVE WRTNG:FIC
 Instructor: BAUSCH, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 733
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	626/1481	4.44	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	633/1396	4.11	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	196/1459	4.75	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1309/1480	4.13	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450	4.86	4.15	4.09	4.28	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.29	4.42	4.51	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	431/1399	4.63	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.28	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.53	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.56	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	159/ 788	4.57	3.97	4.00	4.26	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 493 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN CT
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 734
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.16	4.29	4.45	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	****	4.31	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.33	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	411/1396	4.36	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	354/1342	4.45	4.34	4.07	4.21	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	904/1480	4.73	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	989/1450	3.89	4.15	4.09	4.28	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1258/1409	3.73	4.29	4.42	4.51	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	892/1399	4.18	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	852/1400	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.38	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.87	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	134/1262	4.89	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.53	4.29	4.57	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	232/1256	4.89	4.56	4.30	4.60	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	304/ 788	4.22	3.97	4.00	4.26	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	51/ 68	4.17	4.72	4.49	4.68	4.17	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	52/ 69	4.33	4.75	4.53	4.64	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	42/ 63	4.17	4.33	4.44	4.49	4.17	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	53/ 69	3.83	4.71	4.35	4.53	3.83	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	52/ 68	3.33	4.03	3.92	4.10	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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