

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 664
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1210/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1037/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1123/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	473/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	566/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	763/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1078/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1319/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	718/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1100/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	765/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1003/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	847/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	814/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	839/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	930/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	875/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	705/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 665
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	959/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	607/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	535/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	322/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	162/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	770/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	264/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	478/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	372/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	390/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	303/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 666
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	959/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	607/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	809/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	535/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	621/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	162/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	700/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1301/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	573/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	514/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	478/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	448/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	468/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	540/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	299/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	182/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.55	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 666
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 15
84-150	0	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 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 667
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1433/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1065/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	860/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1070/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1298/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1144/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1359/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1393/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1334/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1270/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	874/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1171/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1097/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	747/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 668
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1220/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1248/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1324/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	892/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	753/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1219/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	714/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1181/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1385/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1353/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1241/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1320/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 669
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	2.82	1500/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	2.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1313/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	6	3	3.82	1061/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	871/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	973/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	839/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	963/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1379/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1142/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1001/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	995/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	1036/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1187/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1136/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	875/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	819/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	2.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 669
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 670
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1338/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1313/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	873/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1174/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	709/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	673/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	444/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	645/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	898/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1155/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	1271/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	1056/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	1126/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1154/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	644/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	930/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	875/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 671
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	462/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	499/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	366/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	295/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	214/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	240/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	630/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	16	2	3.95	1419/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	147/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	512/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	602/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	514/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	394/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	879/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	237/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	398/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	332/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	600/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 672
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	6	6	3	3.63	1356/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	738/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	724/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1122/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	604/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	3	2	6	3.56	1276/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	10	1	3.75	1471/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	525/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1238/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	965/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	965/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1036/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1001/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	743/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	586/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 672
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 673
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	2	1	2	2.58	1508/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	2.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1419/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	766/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1198/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	1	2	2	2.58	1380/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	2.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1265/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1249/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1465/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1355/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	0	3	3.40	1375/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	965/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1228/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	2	0	3	2.90	1382/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	2.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1188/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1187/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	671/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	705/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 673
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 674
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1180/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	419/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	255/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	760/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	207/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	374/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1319/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	296/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	774/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	710/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	835/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	745/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	564/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	468/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	299/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	477/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	407/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.12
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 674
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 675
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	6	7	1	3.47	1417/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1244/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1065/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	977/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	4	3	1	2.64	1376/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	2.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	663/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	956/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	11	2	3.93	1431/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	9	1	3.64	1215/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	1079/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	1157/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1018/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1108/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	899/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	657/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	420/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	569/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	1	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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 676
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	5	6	1	3.67	1338/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1032/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	745/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	860/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	892/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	482/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	275/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1307/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	820/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1031/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1036/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	942/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	869/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	500/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	859/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1094/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	828/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	426/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 15
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 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 677
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	814/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	904/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	425/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	908/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	519/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	435/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	782/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	984/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	408/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	677/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	721/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	816/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	2.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	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	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 678
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	10	5	4.06	1088/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	522/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	275/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	760/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	495/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	406/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1246/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	433/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	552/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	710/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	576/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	611/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	394/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	261/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	299/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	244/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	369/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 679
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	919/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	511/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	444/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	973/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	187/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	940/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	10	0	3.91	1450/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	898/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	877/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	758/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	408/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	357/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	347/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 679
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1801
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 680
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1269/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1248/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	473/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1367/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	663/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	630/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1301/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	984/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1036/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1150/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	849/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	671/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	588/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 681
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	889/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	432/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	629/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	924/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	207/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	630/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	341/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	333/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	392/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	357/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	478/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	267/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	194/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	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 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 682
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	1190/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	3	1	9	4.00	1080/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1142/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	535/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	852/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	434/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	988/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	1054/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	718/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	1	2	10	4.20	1094/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	1271/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	1	10	4.13	980/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	600/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	686/1221	3.82	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	687/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	855/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	855/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	625/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 683
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1122/1522	3.83	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1432/1522	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	938/1285	4.11	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1293/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	760/1412	3.84	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	575/1381	4.32	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1236/1500	4.16	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1495/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1147/1497	4.13	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1385/1440	4.22	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1271/1448	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1282/1436	4.18	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1320/1432	4.11	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	718/1280	4.07	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	875/1269	4.43	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.73	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 684
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	414/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	465/1522	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	6	11	4.32	724/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	149/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	272/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	670/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	14	3	4.05	1372/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	142/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	208/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	326/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	97/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	3	1	1	4	3.00	1064/1221	3.14	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	199/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	421/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	351/1269	4.44	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	588/ 854	3.82	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 685
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	6	6	3	3.25	1464/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	7	5	3.55	1344/1522	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.18	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	1147/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	4	8	4	3.58	1293/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	1154/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1097/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	10	5	3.89	1093/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	11	7	4.21	1289/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1246/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	1349/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	1329/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	5	6	3	3.39	1320/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	3.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	3	7	4	3.39	1309/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	3.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1221	3.14	3.73	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	927/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	0	5	2	3.50	1136/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1059/1269	4.44	4.54	4.31	4.04	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	705/ 854	3.82	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 686
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	10	9	4.09	1067/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	592/1522	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	531/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	582/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	402/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	10	11	4.35	507/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	585/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	911/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	592/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	512/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	494/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	551/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	632/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1011/1221	3.14	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	492/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	363/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	223/1269	4.44	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	407/ 854	3.82	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.11	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****	

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 687
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	4	8	4	3.68	1329/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	1053/1522	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	787/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	903/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	760/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	361/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	6	2	8	3.68	1227/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	15	2	4.00	1389/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	898/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 688
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	707/1522	4.03	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	670/1522	4.22	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	887/1285	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	406/1476	4.21	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	760/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	240/1381	4.34	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	1	9	4.21	819/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	749/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	718/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	716/1440	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	935/1448	4.70	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	601/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	632/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1033/1221	3.14	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	1	7	3.69	945/1280	4.15	4.32	4.10	3.92	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	706/1277	4.34	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	685/1269	4.44	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	426/ 854	3.82	4.05	4.02	3.87	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 689
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	833/1285	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.22	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	871/1476	4.18	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	892/1412	3.91	4.13	4.06	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	482/1381	4.36	4.36	4.08	3.93	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	924/1500	4.11	4.10	4.18	4.16	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	782/1497	4.14	4.22	4.11	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	751/1440	4.55	4.32	4.45	4.40	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1123/1448	4.55	4.71	4.71	4.63	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.24	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	869/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.23	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.73	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	670/1280	4.13	4.32	4.10	3.92	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	891/1277	4.13	4.52	4.34	4.13	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.54	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	756/ 854	3.17	4.05	4.02	3.87	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 210A 0101
 Title
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 690
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	7	19	13	4.07	1074/1522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	10	11	18	4.15	976/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	13	23	4.43	626/1285	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	18	17	4.28	758/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	34	4.85	119/1412	4.85	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	15	20	4.38	470/1381	4.38	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	16	10	11	3.70	1219/1500	3.70	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	5	24	8	2	3.13	1503/1517	3.13	4.47	4.65	4.63	3.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6	16	14	4.14	794/1497	4.14	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	4	14	17	4.28	1031/1440	4.28	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	821/1448	4.77	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	14	18	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	466/1432	4.66	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	0	10	11	7	3.89	701/1221	3.89	3.73	3.93	4.02	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	317/1280	4.61	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	517/1277	4.61	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	325/ 854	4.27	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	15
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 210B 0101
 Title
 Instructor: SCALIA, BILL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 691
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	919/1522	4.24	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1016/1522	4.12	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	690/1285	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	815/1476	4.24	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	61/1412	4.94	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	314/1381	4.53	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	1048/1500	3.94	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	705/1440	4.59	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	436/1436	4.65	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	187/1432	4.88	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	692/1277	4.40	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	6	7	6	3.81	1269/1522	3.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	976/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	105/1285	4.94	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	519/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	2	9	6	3.73	1037/1412	3.73	4.13	4.06	4.00	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	938/1381	3.90	4.36	4.08	3.97	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	5	4	7	3.48	1315/1500	3.48	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	7	12	1	3.57	1487/1517	3.57	4.47	4.65	4.63	3.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	10	1	3.56	1258/1497	3.56	4.22	4.11	4.11	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	11	5	3.86	1266/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.42	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1123/1448	4.55	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	906/1436	4.23	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	838/1432	4.32	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	556/1221	4.13	3.73	3.93	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	839/1280	3.88	4.32	4.10	4.08	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	756/ 854	3.17	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 692
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 693
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	744/1522	4.39	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	12	4.35	698/1285	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	519/1476	4.47	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	305/1412	4.57	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	633/1381	4.23	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	630/1500	4.41	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	8	4.35	1209/1517	4.35	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	469/1497	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	656/1440	4.63	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	838/1432	4.31	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	13	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	485/1269	4.64	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 241 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 693
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 694
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	10	4	15	4.17	980/1522	4.17	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	14	4.38	738/1522	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	10	13	4.38	666/1285	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	14	13	4.38	660/1476	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	191/1412	4.71	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	272/1381	4.57	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	541/1500	4.46	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	22	6	4.21	1289/1517	4.21	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.22	695/1497	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	617/1440	4.65	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	436/1436	4.64	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	2	1	3	4	8	3.83	739/1221	3.83	3.73	3.93	4.02	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	499/1280	4.38	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	773/1277	4.29	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	255/1269	4.88	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 243 0101
 Title CURRENTS IN AMERICAN L
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 694
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	30	Non-major	28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 695
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	3	17	4.27	889/1522	4.27	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	10	13	4.31	824/1522	4.31	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	9	13	4.23	780/1285	4.23	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	8	12	4.08	971/1476	4.08	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	19	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	12	4.04	790/1381	4.04	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	650/1500	4.38	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	4.38	1177/1517	4.38	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	481/1497	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	18	4.58	705/1440	4.58	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	6	16	4.57	527/1436	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	17	4.46	695/1432	4.46	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	0	6	3	4	3.31	991/1221	3.31	3.73	3.93	4.02	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	2	3	11	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	3	9	3.95	979/1277	3.95	4.52	4.34	4.33	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	699/1269	4.37	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.37	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	3	0	1	6	5	3.67	625/ 854	3.67	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 695
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101
 Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI
 Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 696
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	482/1522	4.62	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	9	4	5	3.60	1112/1412	3.60	4.13	4.06	4.00	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	162/1381	4.74	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1321/1500	3.46	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	244/1517	4.95	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	744/1497	4.18	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	728/1440	4.56	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	684/1436	4.44	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	884/1432	4.25	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	214/1280	4.76	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	410/1269	4.72	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 697
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1387/1522	3.55	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1313/1522	3.64	4.25	4.26	4.29	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1285	4.83	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	945/1476	4.11	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1037/1412	3.73	4.13	4.06	4.00	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	1	6	3.91	938/1381	3.91	4.36	4.08	3.97	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1357/1500	3.40	4.10	4.18	4.20	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.47	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.22	4.11	4.11	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	1	4	3.36	1381/1440	3.36	4.32	4.45	4.42	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	1123/1448	4.55	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1251/1436	3.64	4.31	4.29	4.29	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	2	5	3.64	1233/1432	3.64	4.27	4.29	4.31	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.73	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	585/1280	4.25	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	0	6	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	692/1269	4.38	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 698
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	1012/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	670/1522	3.84	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1285	4.20	4.32	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	682/1476	4.03	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	566/1412	4.04	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	331/1381	4.38	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	935/1500	3.39	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1161/1517	4.60	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	898/1497	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	705/1440	3.82	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.90	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	502/1436	3.95	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	548/1432	4.03	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1221	1.86	3.73	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	468/1280	4.42	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	540/1277	4.63	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	430/1269	4.54	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	125/ 854	4.34	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0201
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 699
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1081/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	945/1522	3.84	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	809/1285	4.20	4.32	4.30	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	535/1476	4.03	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	493/1412	4.04	4.13	4.06	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	434/1381	4.38	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	913/1500	3.39	4.10	4.18	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	911/1517	4.60	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	385/1497	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	961/1440	3.82	4.32	4.45	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.90	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	762/1436	3.95	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	995/1432	4.03	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1221	1.86	3.73	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	459/1280	4.42	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.63	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	836/1269	4.54	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.34	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 700
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	6	6	3.67	1338/1522	3.96	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	3	2	2.90	1494/1522	3.84	4.25	4.26	4.29	2.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1285	4.20	4.32	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	5	3	6	3	3.28	1376/1476	4.03	4.37	4.22	4.20	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	7	6	3.52	1154/1412	4.04	4.13	4.06	4.00	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	623/1381	4.38	4.36	4.08	3.97	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	9	5	2	3	0	1.95	1491/1500	3.39	4.10	4.18	4.20	1.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	873/1517	4.60	4.47	4.65	4.63	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	8	8	2	3.58	1250/1497	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.11	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	5	3	6	4	0	2.50	1428/1440	3.82	4.32	4.45	4.42	2.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.90	4.71	4.71	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	8	4	1	2.89	1400/1436	3.95	4.31	4.29	4.29	2.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	5	4	5	3.42	1298/1432	4.03	4.27	4.29	4.31	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	4	0	3	0	0	1.86	1206/1221	1.86	3.73	3.93	4.02	1.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	4	11	4.41	468/1280	4.42	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	540/1277	4.63	4.52	4.34	4.33	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	371/1269	4.54	4.54	4.31	4.33	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	0	3	5	6	3.81	564/ 854	4.34	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.81	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 701
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	779/1522	4.25	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	592/1522	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	509/1285	4.16	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	519/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	214/1412	4.48	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	594/1381	4.13	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	527/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	911/1517	4.77	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	554/1497	3.95	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	492/1440	4.55	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	802/1448	4.82	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	436/1436	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	514/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1221	4.00	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	298/1280	4.62	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	340/1277	4.44	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	277/1269	4.68	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	625/ 854	3.65	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

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	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	1	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	17				

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0301
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 702
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	1022/1522	4.25	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1080/1522	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	5	5	3.80	1065/1285	4.16	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	971/1476	4.28	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	538/1412	4.48	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	806/1381	4.13	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	4	2	0	7	3.77	1175/1500	4.12	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	600/1517	4.77	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1261/1497	3.95	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	969/1440	4.55	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	629/1448	4.82	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	772/1436	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1108/1432	4.27	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	324/1280	4.62	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	903/1277	4.44	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	586/1269	4.68	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	643/ 854	3.65	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 16
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	13
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 703
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	669/1522	4.46	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	738/1522	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	660/1476	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	709/1412	4.09	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	263/1381	4.58	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	11	4.04	966/1500	4.04	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	438/1517	4.92	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	602/1497	4.30	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	904/1440	4.42	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	865/1436	4.26	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	877/1432	4.26	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	376/1280	4.52	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	363/1277	4.76	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	501/1269	4.62	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	625/ 854	3.67	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 704
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	305/1522	4.76	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	686/1522	4.41	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	446/1285	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	444/1476	4.53	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	71/1412	4.94	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	543/1381	4.31	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1301/1517	4.20	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	578/1440	4.69	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	684/1436	4.44	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1432	4.88	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	814/1280	3.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	908/1277	4.08	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	828/1269	4.17	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	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	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 305 0101
 Title BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 705
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	681/1522	4.45	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	639/1522	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	5	21	4.59	446/1285	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	248/1412	4.64	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	14	4.29	575/1381	4.29	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	415/1500	4.57	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	12	14	4.44	457/1497	4.44	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	1	25	4.79	392/1440	4.79	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	27	4.89	521/1448	4.89	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	2	25	4.82	198/1436	4.82	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	24	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	23	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	324/1280	4.61	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	299/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	310/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	341/ 854	4.24	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.24	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 706
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	1027/1522	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	519/1476	4.47	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	167/1412	4.75	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	556/1381	4.30	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	882/1500	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	1128/1517	4.45	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	820/1497	4.11	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	578/1440	4.68	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	802/1448	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	576/1436	4.53	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	490/1432	4.63	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	311/1280	4.63	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	308/1277	4.81	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	493/1269	4.63	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	705/ 854	3.40	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101
 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 707
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	492/1522	4.61	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	236/1476	4.74	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	22	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	255/1381	4.59	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	374/1500	4.62	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	20	6	4.19	1307/1517	4.19	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	288/1440	4.85	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	338/1432	4.76	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	2	7	8	5	3.61	860/1221	3.61	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	6	15	4.59	516/1269	4.59	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	1	0	7	2	2	3.33	726/ 854	3.33	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	27
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101
 Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 708
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	8	21	4.42	707/1522	4.42	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	25	4.55	499/1522	4.55	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	27	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	406/1476	4.58	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	5	25	4.63	265/1412	4.63	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	214/1381	4.66	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.66	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	6	21	4.55	444/1500	4.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	341/1517	4.94	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	31	4.94	346/1448	4.94	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	24	4.69	394/1436	4.69	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	26	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	3	4	4	13	3.88	707/1221	3.88	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	6	18	4.52	383/1280	4.52	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	433/1277	4.70	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	1	0	8	7	4	3.65	630/ 854	3.65	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.65	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 26
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 6	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 33 Non-major 7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 11	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 24	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 320 0101
 Title TOPICS IN CT
 Instructor: WEXLER, LAURA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 709
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1522	4.90	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1285	4.86	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	92/1381	4.89	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	109/1500	4.90	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 710
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1190/1522	3.94	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1276/1522	3.73	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	1141/1476	3.88	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	680/1412	4.13	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	774/1381	4.07	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	1	4	6	3.56	1276/1500	3.56	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1185/1517	4.38	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1034/1497	3.91	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	2	1	5	3.31	1390/1440	3.31	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1131/1448	4.54	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1231/1436	3.69	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1224/1432	3.67	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	631/1280	4.18	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	643/1277	4.45	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	485/1269	4.64	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	0	1	0	6	3.89	533/ 854	3.89	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.89	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 326 0101
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 711
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	965/1522	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	456/1285	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	1257/1476	3.64	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	2	1	4	5	3.12	1317/1412	3.12	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	2	1	3	3	2.39	1363/1381	2.39	4.36	4.08	4.13	2.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	242/1500	4.72	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	532/1517	4.88	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1265/1497	3.53	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	859/1448	4.75	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1169/1436	3.88	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	970/1432	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101
 Title CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 712
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	7	12	4.27	879/1522	4.27	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	13	4.23	904/1522	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	15	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	288/1412	4.59	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	361/1381	4.48	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	13	4.32	720/1500	4.32	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	487/1517	4.90	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	765/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	696/1436	4.43	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	611/1432	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	387/1221	4.37	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	207/1280	4.78	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	277/ 854	4.35	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.35	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101
 Title CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 712
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 346 0101
 Title LITERARY THEMES
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 713
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	190/1522	4.89	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1522	4.78	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	316/1476	4.67	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	904/1440	4.43	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Instructor: ORLIN, LENA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 24

Spring 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	14	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	14	4.33	787/1522	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	7	10	4.14	857/1285	4.14	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	12	6	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	265/1412	4.63	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	11	6	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	4.36	4.08	4.13	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	556/1500	4.46	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1246/1517	4.29	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	421/1497	4.47	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	774/1440	4.52	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	1	17	4.62	1060/1448	4.62	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	2	14	4.43	696/1436	4.43	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	732/1432	4.43	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	232/1221	4.57	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	12	4.39	492/1280	4.39	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	409/1277	4.72	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	361/1269	4.78	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	701/ 854	3.42	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	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	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 369 0101
 Title RACE ETHNICITY US LIT
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 715
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	414/1522	4.69	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1476	4.79	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	111/1412	4.88	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	114/1381	4.81	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	425/1500	4.56	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	12	1	3.93	1431/1517	3.93	4.47	4.65	4.62	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	280/1497	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	763/1440	4.53	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	346/1448	4.93	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	372/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	474/1221	4.23	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	370/1280	4.53	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	398/1277	4.73	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	156/1269	4.93	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 716
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	305/1522	4.77	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	322/1522	4.69	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	216/1476	4.77	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	655/1412	4.15	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1381	4.92	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	454/1500	4.54	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.85	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	304/1497	4.62	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	444/1448	4.92	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	188/1436	4.83	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	820/1432	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	343/1221	4.43	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1280	4.90	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/1277	4.90	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	223/1269	4.90	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101
 Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING
 Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 717
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1027/1285	3.91	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	416/1476	4.56	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	7	3.81	964/1412	3.81	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	233/1381	4.63	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	7	5	3.81	1141/1500	3.81	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	691/1517	4.81	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	718/1497	4.20	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	1023/1440	4.29	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	935/1448	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	772/1436	4.36	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	963/1432	4.14	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	950/1221	3.42	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	605/1280	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	827/1277	4.22	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 386 0101
 Title ADULT LITERACY TUTORIN
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 718
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	681/1522	4.44	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	639/1522	4.44	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	827/1476	4.22	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.78	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.71	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	953/1440	4.38	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	585/1280	4.25	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.63	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	174/ 854	4.57	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
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: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 719
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1074/1522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1080/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1114/1285	3.69	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	435/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	5	1	3	3.23	1293/1412	3.49	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	458/1381	4.53	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	4	5	3.85	1123/1500	3.79	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1054/1517	4.05	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1089/1497	4.05	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	751/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	737/1448	4.76	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	551/1436	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	935/1432	4.20	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	359/1221	4.30	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	718/1280	4.31	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.65	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	816/1269	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	4.11	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		13
			I 0		Non-major
			? 0		9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 720
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	869/1522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	13	4.29	844/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1285	3.69	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	519/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	5	9	3.86	932/1412	3.49	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	314/1381	4.53	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	4	3	4	8	3.70	1219/1500	3.79	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	623/1517	4.05	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	731/1497	4.05	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	840/1448	4.76	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	415/1436	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	862/1432	4.20	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1221	4.30	3.73	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	553/1280	4.31	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	317/1277	4.65	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	547/1269	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	505/ 854	4.11	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 721
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	4	6	3.83	1254/1522	4.07	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	965/1522	4.15	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1285	3.69	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	613/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1239/1412	3.49	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	207/1381	4.53	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	4	1	9	3.83	1129/1500	3.79	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	5	8	3	0	2.76	1511/1517	4.05	4.47	4.65	4.62	2.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	807/1497	4.05	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	7	7	4.19	1100/1440	4.50	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	977/1448	4.76	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	987/1436	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	977/1432	4.20	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	500/1221	4.30	3.73	3.93	3.94	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	305/1280	4.31	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	567/1277	4.65	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1269	4.52	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	314/ 854	4.11	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 722
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	605/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	483/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.73	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0201
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 723
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	932/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0301
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 724
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	605/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	988/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 725
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	793/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	820/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 726
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 727
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	814/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	703/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1353/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1036/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	530/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 728
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.73	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 729
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1327/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 1001
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 730
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.81	4.17	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	4.50	4.13	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	4.93	4.36	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	4.61	4.10	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.47	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	4.80	4.22	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.81	4.32	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.71	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.67	4.31	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.73	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.92	4.32	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 731
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	7	3	3.55	1383/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	4	3.70	1290/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	938/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	682/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	8	3	3.50	1165/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	6	4	4	3.15	1413/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	802/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	5	6	0	3.31	1355/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	6	7	5	3.75	1304/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	1262/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	8	5	3.80	1197/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	9	4	6	3.75	1191/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	2	7	2	2	2.88	1111/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	718/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	879/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	756/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	673/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 732
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	4	3	4	3.06	1485/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	8	3.76	1262/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1346/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	5	2	0	3.00	1327/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	6	6	3.65	1108/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	6	3	3.24	1399/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	3	4.06	1372/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	6	3	1	3.00	1418/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	6	4	5	3.59	1347/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	1	8	4	3.59	1417/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	3.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	5	4	5	3.63	1254/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	4	5	3	3.06	1359/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	5	3	4	3.33	983/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	978/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1024/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	972/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	11	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	15

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 733
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	767/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	334/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	898/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	316/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	629/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	331/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	720/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1268/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	525/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	891/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	737/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	478/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	784/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	956/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	1	0	6	3.90	825/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	903/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	743/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	426/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HESS, LAURIE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 734
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1043/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	639/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	316/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1100/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	207/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1099/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	932/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	782/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1186/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1310/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	672/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1134/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	727/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	477/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	166/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0601
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HESS, LAURIE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 735
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	2	2	2	2.67	1505/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	1	2	0	4	2.91	1494/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	2.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1394/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	0	5	1	0	2.18	1398/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	2.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1338/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1388/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1355/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	0	3	3	0	2.50	1476/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	2	1	3	3.00	1404/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1441/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1378/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	0	2	1	2	2.36	1409/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	2.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	1188/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1273/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1272/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1258/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HESS, LAURIE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 736
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1122/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	670/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	473/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	0	2	2	5	3.50	1165/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	272/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	882/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	983/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	769/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1186/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1024/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1018/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	1	3	5	3.46	1284/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	983/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	718/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 737
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	1	9	4.07	1081/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	1211/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1111/1285	3.92	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	703/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	3	6	3.73	1029/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	988/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	11	3	4.07	1368/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1167/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	931/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	1241/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	980/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	928/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1111/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	839/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	804/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	692/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	604/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 15	Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0901
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 738
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	3	2	4	3.29	1459/1522	3.64	4.17	4.30	4.34	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	3	2	3.31	1426/1522	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.25	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	966/1476	4.15	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1189/1412	3.40	4.13	4.06	4.03	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1381	4.00	4.36	4.08	4.13	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	5	2	1	1	2.33	1477/1500	3.55	4.10	4.18	4.13	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1389/1517	4.31	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1057/1497	3.64	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1324/1440	3.86	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1190/1448	4.18	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1275/1436	3.90	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1284/1432	3.57	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	1114/1221	3.11	3.73	3.93	3.94	2.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1240/1280	3.57	4.32	4.10	4.14	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1066/1277	4.01	4.52	4.34	4.38	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	875/1269	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	3.95	4.05	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	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 393E 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 739
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	2	3	3	2	2.67	1505/1522	2.67	4.17	4.30	4.34	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	2	3	2	3	2.73	1501/1522	2.73	4.25	4.26	4.25	2.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	1205/1285	3.38	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1334/1476	3.47	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	3	3	3	2.87	1355/1412	2.87	4.13	4.06	4.03	2.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	3	1	6	3.27	1246/1381	3.27	4.36	4.08	4.13	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	3	2	4	3.13	1416/1500	3.13	4.10	4.18	4.13	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	952/1517	4.64	4.47	4.65	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1395/1497	3.17	4.22	4.11	4.13	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	2	2	0	4	3.00	1404/1440	3.00	4.32	4.45	4.46	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	4	1	4	3.42	1430/1448	3.42	4.71	4.71	4.71	3.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	4	1	4	3.42	1311/1436	3.42	4.31	4.29	4.30	3.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	2	2	2	2.58	1397/1432	2.58	4.27	4.29	4.29	2.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	4	0	0	0	1	1.80	1207/1221	1.80	3.73	3.93	3.94	1.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1089/1269	3.63	4.54	4.31	4.39	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	604/ 854	3.71	4.05	4.02	4.00	3.71	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 739
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	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	1	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 740
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.57	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	4.44	4.25	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	4.67	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	4.72	4.37	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1412	4.89	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	4.83	4.36	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1500	4.56	4.10	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.74	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	4.75	4.32	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	4.94	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	4.56	4.31	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	4.75	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.73	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	4.83	4.32	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	4.75	4.52	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0201
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 741
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	814/1522	4.57	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1200/1522	4.44	4.25	4.26	4.34	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	706/1285	4.67	4.32	4.30	4.42	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	566/1476	4.72	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	155/1412	4.89	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	207/1381	4.83	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	924/1500	4.56	4.10	4.18	4.25	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.74	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1073/1497	4.43	4.22	4.11	4.21	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	798/1440	4.75	4.32	4.45	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.94	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	987/1436	4.56	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1432	4.75	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	286/1280	4.83	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	594/1277	4.75	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	461/1269	4.83	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	****	

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 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 742
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1522	4.55	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	702/1522	4.20	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	766/1285	3.88	4.32	4.30	4.42	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.30	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.63	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1381	4.57	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.32	4.10	4.18	4.25	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1161/1517	4.53	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1497	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	4.25	4.32	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	4.83	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1432	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	4.83	3.73	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	4.75	4.32	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	4.67	4.52	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.42	4.54	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	4.33	4.05	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0201
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 743
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	605/1522	4.55	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1080/1522	4.20	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1160/1285	3.88	4.32	4.30	4.42	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1174/1476	4.30	4.37	4.22	4.31	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	339/1412	4.63	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	519/1381	4.57	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1129/1500	4.32	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	932/1517	4.53	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	385/1497	4.75	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1359/1440	4.25	4.32	4.45	4.52	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1001/1448	4.83	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1056/1436	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	175/1221	4.83	3.73	3.93	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1280	4.75	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	743/1277	4.67	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	989/1269	4.42	4.54	4.31	4.49	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	625/ 854	4.33	4.05	4.02	4.31	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 410A 0101
 Title FORMALIST POETRY
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 744
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.17	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.25	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.10	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1037/1517	4.56	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.22	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.31	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	3.73	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	461/1269	4.67	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.10	4.18	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1268/1517	4.25	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1331/1440	3.67	4.32	4.45	4.52	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.73	3.93	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 448 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 746
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1043/1522	4.11	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.32	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	392/1381	4.44	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	756/1497	4.17	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1112/1440	4.17	4.32	4.45	4.52	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	743/1277	4.33	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.05	4.02	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 473 0101
 Title ADV CREATIVE WRITG:POET
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 747
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	211/1522	4.86	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	265/1476	4.71	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.13	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1136/1381	3.57	4.36	4.08	4.21	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1415/1500	3.14	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.32	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	845/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	956/1221	3.40	3.73	3.93	4.04	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1280	4.83	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	65/ 79	4.33	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.88	4.52	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	64/ 78	4.00	4.38	4.45	4.58	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.14	****	

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

Course-Section: ENGL 486 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 748
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1522	4.88	4.17	4.30	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.32	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	406/1476	4.57	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1412	4.88	4.13	4.06	4.11	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.36	4.08	4.21	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.10	4.18	4.25	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	973/1517	4.63	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1124/1440	4.14	4.32	4.45	4.52	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.71	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	845/1436	4.29	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	500/1221	4.20	3.73	3.93	4.04	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	253/1280	4.71	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.67	4.58	4.67	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	45/ 77	4.75	4.88	4.52	4.60	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 65	4.75	4.75	4.49	4.65	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 78	4.75	4.38	4.45	4.58	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	40/ 80	4.33	4.33	4.11	4.14	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1	Graduate	2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	6
Grad.	2	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 493 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN CT
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 749
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1338/1522	3.67	4.17	4.30	4.42	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1303/1522	3.67	4.25	4.26	4.34	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1065/1285	3.80	4.32	4.30	4.42	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	916/1412	3.88	4.13	4.06	4.11	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1252/1381	3.22	4.36	4.08	4.21	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.10	4.18	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.47	4.65	4.71	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1359/1440	3.50	4.32	4.45	4.52	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.71	4.71	4.75	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1282/1436	3.50	4.31	4.29	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1364/1432	3.00	4.27	4.29	4.34	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	759/1221	3.80	3.73	3.93	4.04	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.32	4.10	4.28	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.52	4.34	4.50	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	828/1269	4.17	4.54	4.31	4.49	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.05	4.02	4.31	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.88	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.14	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 2		