Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	26
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	5	7	5	3.55	1386/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	7	6	3.65	1324/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	974/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	1	6	6	3.76	1204/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	10	3	3.72	1058/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	8	5	3.67	1117/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	3	4	3	4	3.00	1432/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	612/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1091/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1345/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	1142/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1202/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	1	7	6	3.72	1245/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1268/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1092/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1036/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	725/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01		Term - Fall 2011					Enrollment: 26			
Title:	Composition							Questionnaires: 20			
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon										

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 26
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon					

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Burns,Margie				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	6	3	3.50	1409/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	1147/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	1042/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	949/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1261/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	776/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	7	2	3.56	1302/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	8	1	3.53	1275/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	1093/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	903/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1179/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1286/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	3	6	3	3.47	1076/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1132/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1012/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	709/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Burns,Margie			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	10	8	4.04	1094/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	13	9	4.24	902/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	9	9	4.00	1010/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	550/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	385/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	965/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	237/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	12	5	4.10	822/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	552/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	727/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	699/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	777/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	7	10	4	3.61	1019/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	19	4.73	256/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	564/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	107/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	424/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	20	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 04	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Brofman,Margare		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	8	4	3.53	1399/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1147/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1060/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	985/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	5	3.68	1083/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	977/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	957/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	6	4	2	3.06	1410/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	1162/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	1142/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	5	7	3.84	1196/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	5	6	3.63	1275/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	3	0	3	3	1	2.90	1244/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	4	2	6	3.41	1088/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	7	4	3	3.29	1171/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	1077/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	861/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	2.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 26
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	15	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	7	3	1	2.81	1504/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	2.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1206/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	6	1	8	4.13	902/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	1	8	3.87	1147/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	5	3	3.19	1309/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	5	3	3.56	1166/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	4	1	5	3.25	1399/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	11	0	3.56	1510/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	3.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	7	1	3.53	1275/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	4	5	3.75	1337/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	1246/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	920/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	1	7	3.88	1184/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	5	3	5	3.73	942/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	921/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	922/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	781/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	571/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	7	5	3.89	1223/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	1054/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	535/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	978/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	595/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	5	8	3.89	1109/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	1377/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	9	3	3.83	1075/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1070/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1142/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1257/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1094/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06		Term - Fall 2011				Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition						Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole						

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 07	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Wilkinson,Rache		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	413/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	374/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	546/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	535/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	473/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	283/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	11	4.10	916/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	296/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	297/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	216/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	334/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	384/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	3	1	4	8	4.06	692/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	471/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	415/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	302/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	618/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 07	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 07	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	6	11	3	3.61	1363/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	9	4.09	1034/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	10	4.04	990/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	7	6	7	3.77	1028/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	9	9	4.14	759/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	5	5	8	3.73	1232/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	5	10	1	3.65	1217/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	11	10	4.35	1019/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	942/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	14	4	3.91	1153/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	11	8	4.04	1077/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	10	5	3	3.45	1081/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	603/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	645/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	277/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	6	11	2	3.70	636/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	14	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	9	7	3.82	1271/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	15	4.41	723/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	909/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	13	4.32	735/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	7	6	3.59	1143/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	635/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	726/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	4	4.18	1360/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	13	4	4.11	822/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	14	4.41	967/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	5	12	4.24	937/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	8	10	4.14	1033/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	7	8	4	3.50	1057/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	5	8	3.76	927/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	9	10	4.23	792/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	865/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	629/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.72

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Fall 2011

| Enrollment: 25 |
| Questionnaires: 22 |

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	13	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	5	8	4.05	1088/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	847/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	974/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	906/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1330/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	445/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1184/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1214/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	8	5	4.06	856/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	664/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	1120/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	761/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	945/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	668/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	766/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	727/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	404/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	533/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	14	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12			Term - Fall 2011								Enrollment:	26
Title:	Composition											Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane												

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	8	6	4.00	1118/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	893/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	735/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1132/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	506/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1142/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1280/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	706/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	808/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	701/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	487/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	888/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	272/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	516/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	273/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	649/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	349/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	8	9	2	3.39	1441/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	9	6	3.83	1235/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	4	9	3.83	1171/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	8	3	7	3.48	1198/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	8	3	7	3.50	1198/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	7	6	5	3.48	1329/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	8	9	2	3.68	1188/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	712/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	942/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	8	10	4.22	955/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	4	11	4.00	1094/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	12	4	3	3.27	1151/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	6	6	6	3.75	934/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	902/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	765/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	440/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.06

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	17	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 14	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	10	5	3.81	1277/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	989/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	821/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	749/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	364/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	6	8	3.95	1050/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	3	11	3	4.00	891/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	808/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	544/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	736/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	14	4.38	810/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	6	6	3	3.32	1139/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	318/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	395/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	128/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.95

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 14		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I						

Questions			Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	206/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.47

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	23
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	6	5	3.75	1302/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	681/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	795/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	980/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	717/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	725/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	893/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1136/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	0	2	10	4.27	1085/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	1224/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	964/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	866/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	659/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	567/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	303/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	694/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 15		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 23
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Kidd,Kathleen A					

Questions			Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	241/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 100 16**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **25**
Title: **Composition**		Questionnaires: **2**
Instructor: **Rollins,John V**		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1409/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1331/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1318/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1435/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1483/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1230/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1394/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1075/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1402/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1314/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	766/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1240/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1231/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 16	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	2
Instructor:	Rollins,John V				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	889/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 17	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	6	7	2	3.56	1381/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	834/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1183/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	1083/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	595/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	6	2	4	3.25	1399/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1233/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	6	1	3.67	1203/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	10	2	3.81	1320/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1195/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	865/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	888/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1210/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	624/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	822/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	544/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	2	4	5	3	3.47	720/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.47

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 17		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R					

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 19	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	6	8	3.81	1277/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	989/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	916/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	800/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	570/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	4	10	3.95	902/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	859/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	592/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	695/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	616/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	727/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	614/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	866/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1045/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	298/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	666/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	505/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	516/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.93

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 19	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Sneeringer,Holl		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	11	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 20		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Sneeringer,Holl				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1178/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	785/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	721/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	821/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	362/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	776/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	5	6	2	3.57	1299/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	835/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	712/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	806/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	842/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	936/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	966/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	504/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	655/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	505/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	533/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 20	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 20	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 21		Term - Fall 2011				Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition						Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl							

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	9	6	4.00	1118/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	584/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	494/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	564/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	450/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	364/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	4	8	3.86	1142/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	351/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	772/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1108/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	637/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	566/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	3	3	6	1	3.38	1113/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	298/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	537/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	341/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	456/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 21	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl		

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 22		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Carillo,John P					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	778/1520	3.70	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	639/1520	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1291	4.22	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	800/1483	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1034/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	162/1405	4.14	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1159/1504	3.76	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1435/1519	4.62	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	532/1495	3.86	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	886/1459	4.36	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	637/1455	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	810/1456	4.12	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	392/1316	3.46	3.65	4.03	3.91	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	372/1243	4.15	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	686/1241	4.12	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1236	4.44	4.55	4.40	4.19	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/889	3.71	4.03	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 22	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Carillo,John P		

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	581/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	294/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	525/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	222/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	97/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	275/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	814/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1260/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	306/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	696/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	272/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	268/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	342/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	3	1	3	5	3.43	1096/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	256/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	303/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	128/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	2	0	5	1	1	2.89	849/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	2.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	**Composition**				**Questionnaires:**	**21**
Instructor:	**Dunnigan,Brian**					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	14	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 04	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 25**
Title: Composition		**Questionnaires: 22**
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian		

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	9	7	4.05	1094/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	9	12	4.41	723/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	974/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	768/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	511/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	219/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	814/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1354/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	351/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	1002/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	544/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	512/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	714/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	2	4	3	4	3.06	1206/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	372/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	625/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	378/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	653/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 100A 04**	**Term - Fall 2011**			Enrollment:	**25**
Title:	**Composition**				Questionnaires:	**22**
Instructor:	**Dunnigan,Brian**					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 07	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Brofman,Margare		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	7	3	3.42	1433/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	4	3.79	1258/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	944/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	960/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	8	3	3.68	1083/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1082/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	7	4	4	3.42	1347/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	632/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	8	7	0	3.47	1301/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	8	4	3.79	1329/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	1216/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	8	3	3.68	1268/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	7	4	3.79	1224/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	4	2	4	1	0	2.18	1302/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	7	5	0	3.21	1154/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	3	8	2	0	2.79	1217/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	2.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	6	5	1	3.36	1170/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	3.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	1	4	3	0	2.80	861/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	2.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 10	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	1016/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	723/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	894/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	735/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	511/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	481/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	301/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1307/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	390/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	712/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	272/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	463/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	735/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	3	1	3	2	4	3.23	1163/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	11	4.05	753/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	425/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	214/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	6	8	1	3.56	691/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 10		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Dunnigan,Brian				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 13	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Pekarske,Nicole		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	6	3.90	1218/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	6	8	3.90	1189/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1136/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	906/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	932/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	457/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	694/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	11	2	3.75	1502/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1045/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	886/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1172/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	937/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	810/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1264/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	610/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	528/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	819/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	255/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	5	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	17	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 16		Term - Fall 2011								Enrollment:	25	
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires:	24	
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	1008/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	360/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	404/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	336/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	596/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	243/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	331/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1307/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	661/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	900/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	489/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	450/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	453/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	3	5	10	3.86	853/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	10	9	4.13	716/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	792/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	824/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	424/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 100A 16**		**Term - Fall 2011**									Enrollment:	**25**
Title:	**Composition**											Questionnaires:	**24**
Instructor:	**Killgallon,Dona**												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 16		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires:	24
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona						

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Walters,April I			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	8	5	3	3.37	1450/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	11	3	3.70	1302/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1136/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	0	6	6	2	3.24	1415/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	6	5	3	3.26	1281/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	2	6	7	3.84	1010/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	4	3	6	1	2.68	1466/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	2.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	1377/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	2	5	4	1	3.33	1349/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	6	5	3	3	3.06	1435/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	1238/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	10	2	3.65	1280/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	8	4	2	3.17	1386/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	6	3	2	3	2.76	1259/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	4	4	4	3.53	1048/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1127/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1031/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	700/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.54

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22		Term - Fall 2011						Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition								Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Walters,April I									

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 100A 22**		**Term - Fall 2011**				**Enrollment: 25**
Title:	**Composition**						**Questionnaires: 20**
Instructor:	**Walters,April I**						

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	5	3	3.44	1430/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1158/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1064/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	8	3	3.63	1272/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	6	3	3.25	1285/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	843/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1214/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	1273/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1008/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1144/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1313/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	976/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1184/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	2	4	4	0	2.83	1251/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	3	5	3.56	1036/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	2	6	4	3.50	1135/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	947/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	577/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 100A 28**	**Term - Fall 2011**		**Enrollment: 24**
Title:	**Composition**			**Questionnaires: 16**
Instructor:	**Pats,Victoria R**			

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 31	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: MacDougall,Elai		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1218/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	374/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1055/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	778/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	1	5	5	3	3.11	1326/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	9	9	4.05	823/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	3	11	3.90	1101/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1197/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	749/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	940/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	675/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	736/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	866/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	2	1	4	12	4.05	704/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	5	11	4.10	743/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	3	3	12	4.05	906/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	391/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	379/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 100A 31**				**Term - Fall 2011**						**Enrollment: 25**
Title:	**Composition**										**Questionnaires: 21**
Instructor:	**MacDougall,Elai**										

				Frequencies				**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 31		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	MacDougall,Elai				

Questions				**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 34	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Young,Michael A		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	12	5	4.05	1094/1520	3.90	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	940/1520	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1172/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	735/1483	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	9	7	3.86	963/1417	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	716/1405	4.26	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	924/1504	3.98	3.94	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	794/1519	4.34	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	484/1495	4.09	4.03	4.11	4.01	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	1168/1459	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	2	16	4.48	1216/1460	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	699/1455	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	900/1456	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1096/1316	3.16	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	859/1243	4.00	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	755/1241	4.08	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	649/1236	4.36	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	589/889	3.68	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.82

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 100A 34**	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: **25**
Title: **Composition**			Questionnaires: **22**
Instructor: **Young,Michael A**			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 34
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Young,Michael A

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 100P 01**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **13**
Title: **Composition**		Questionnaires: **11**
Instructor: **Sneeringer,Holl**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	802/1520	4.36	4.10	4.31	4.14	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	847/1520	4.30	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	232/1291	4.80	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	680/1483	4.36	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	417/1417	4.45	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	259/1405	4.64	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1101/1504	3.91	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	592/1519	4.91	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1159/1495	3.73	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1283/1460	4.38	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	637/1455	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	821/1456	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.65	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	200/1243	4.80	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.14	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	341/1236	4.80	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100P 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	13
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl				

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	360/889	4.20	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 100Y 01**		**Term - Fall 2011**							**Enrollment: 24**
Title:	**Composition**									**Questionnaires: 19**
Instructor:	**Pekarske,Nicole**									

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	10	4	3.79	1287/1520	3.38	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	2	9	3.83	1229/1520	3.30	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	232/1291	4.40	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	949/1483	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	701/1417	3.36	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	364/1405	3.98	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	3	8	3.79	1196/1504	3.36	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	16	1	3.95	1466/1519	4.35	4.57	4.70	4.71	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1166/1495	3.34	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	1192/1459	3.63	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	544/1460	4.70	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1162/1455	3.52	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1171/1456	3.49	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1316	3.06	3.65	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	493/1243	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	220/1241	4.21	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	454/1236	4.32	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	166/889	3.96	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	3	A	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	15	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 03	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	10	4	1	2.85	1503/1520	3.38	4.10	4.31	4.14	2.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	4	6	4	0	2.47	1508/1520	3.30	4.23	4.27	4.20	2.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1291	4.40	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	7	4	2	3.00	1447/1483	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	3	4	2	1	2.50	1395/1417	3.36	4.00	4.08	4.02	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	3	5	5	3.26	1289/1405	3.98	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	5	3	8	0	1	2.35	1485/1504	3.36	3.94	4.16	4.13	2.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	967/1519	4.35	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	2	8	1	2	2.71	1470/1495	3.34	4.03	4.11	4.01	2.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	7	2	6	2	3	2.60	1454/1459	3.63	4.39	4.47	4.40	2.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	1195/1460	4.70	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	4	6	2	2	2.50	1443/1455	3.52	4.35	4.32	4.26	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	6	4	2	2.80	1427/1456	3.49	4.31	4.34	4.26	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	7	5	2	3.29	1145/1316	3.06	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1168/1243	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	922/1241	4.21	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	947/1236	4.32	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	822/889	3.96	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	4	A	0	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	12	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 05	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 22
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Hickernell,Mary		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	5	2	3.62	1359/1520	3.38	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	1342/1520	3.30	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1291	4.40	4.35	4.33	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	906/1483	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	2	3	3.23	1292/1417	3.36	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	605/1405	3.98	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	1208/1504	3.36	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1314/1519	4.35	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1232/1495	3.34	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1273/1459	3.63	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1012/1460	4.70	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1236/1455	3.52	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	1282/1456	3.49	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	4	0	0	0	2	2.33	1298/1316	3.06	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	970/1243	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.98	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	922/1241	4.21	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	885/1236	4.32	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 05	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 22
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	709/889	3.96	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 07	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	23
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Walters,April I			

| Questions | NR | NA | \multicolumn{5}{c}{Frequencies} | | | | | \multicolumn{2}{c}{Instructor} | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1472/1520	3.38	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1433/1520	3.30	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	974/1291	4.40	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1267/1483	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1167/1417	3.36	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1034/1405	3.98	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1307/1504	3.36	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1087/1519	4.35	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	2	1	3.33	1349/1495	3.34	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1284/1459	3.63	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	962/1460	4.70	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1162/1455	3.52	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	0	3	4	3.64	1275/1456	3.49	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1041/1316	3.06	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1243	3.92	4.33	4.17	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	922/1241	4.21	4.40	4.33	4.14	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	725/1236	4.32	4.55	4.40	4.19	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/889	3.96	4.03	4.02	3.89	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 07	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 23
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Walters,April I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100Y 07		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	23
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Walters,April I					

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	19
Title:	Composition ESL Students			Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Ware,Olga G				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	2	3	4	3.14	1491/1520	3.54	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	3	3	3.07	1460/1520	3.57	4.23	4.27	4.20	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1252/1291	3.67	4.35	4.33	4.24	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	4	2	4	3.31	1400/1483	3.54	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1187/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	2	4	3.00	1331/1405	3.54	4.30	4.12	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	2	2	3	2.77	1462/1504	3.28	3.94	4.16	4.13	2.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1382/1519	4.30	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	1	1	3	3.00	1415/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	2	1	5	3.33	1411/1459	3.70	4.39	4.47	4.40	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1447/1460	4.08	4.74	4.74	4.68	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	0	2	3	3	3.08	1396/1455	3.65	4.35	4.32	4.26	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	1	3	3	3.08	1395/1456	3.43	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	4	0	1	3	2	2.90	1244/1316	3.03	3.65	4.03	3.91	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1209/1243	2.86	4.33	4.17	3.98	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	0	5	0	3.14	1193/1241	3.14	4.40	4.33	4.14	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	0	4	0	2.86	1214/1236	2.86	4.55	4.40	4.19	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	679/889	3.60	4.03	4.02	3.89	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 19
Title:	Composition ESL Students			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Ware,Olga G			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 110 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 19**	
Title: Composition ESL Students		**Questionnaires: 14**	
Instructor: Ware,Olga G			

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 110 04**	**Term - Fall 2011**		Enrollment:	**16**
Title:	**Composition ESL Students**			Questionnaires:	**14**
Instructor:	**Wowk,Tymofey E**				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1198/1520	3.54	4.10	4.31	4.14	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1041/1520	3.57	4.23	4.27	4.20	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	880/1291	3.67	4.35	4.33	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1204/1483	3.54	4.26	4.23	4.09	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	2	6	4.00	803/1417	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	808/1405	3.54	4.30	4.12	3.96	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1196/1504	3.28	3.94	4.16	4.13	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1163/1519	4.30	4.57	4.70	4.71	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1045/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.01	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1203/1459	3.70	4.39	4.47	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1142/1460	4.08	4.74	4.74	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	955/1455	3.65	4.35	4.32	4.26	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1224/1456	3.43	4.31	4.34	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	1	6	1	3.17	1184/1316	3.03	3.65	4.03	3.91	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1243	2.86	4.33	4.17	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1241	3.14	4.40	4.33	4.14	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1236	2.86	4.55	4.40	4.19	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/889	3.60	4.03	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 04		Term - Fall 2011				Enrollment: 16
Title:	Composition ESL Students						Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Wowk,Tymofey E						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 50
Title:	Introduction To Lit			Questionnaires: 41
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	12	26	4.54	568/1520	4.54	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	29	4.66	374/1520	4.66	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	16	22	4.50	546/1291	4.50	4.35	4.33	4.44	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	5	11	18	4.31	735/1483	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	29	4.68	211/1417	4.68	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	2	14	16	4.29	615/1405	4.29	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	9	28	4.63	311/1504	4.63	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	31	9	4.23	1335/1519	4.23	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	14	17	4.50	351/1495	4.50	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	159/1459	4.93	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	36	4.90	544/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	194/1455	4.88	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	32	4.78	356/1456	4.78	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	5	30	4.67	198/1316	4.67	3.65	4.03	4.18	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/1243	****	4.33	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	755/1241	4.27	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	****/1236	****	4.55	4.40	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 50
Title:	Introduction To Lit			Questionnaires: 41
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	41	Non-major	39
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 40
Title:	English Grammar Usage			Questionnaires: 35
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	13	18	4.48	636/1520	4.48	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	319/1520	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	222/1291	4.82	4.35	4.33	4.44	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	10	17	4.42	621/1483	4.42	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	10	16	4.15	701/1417	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	1	6	5	13	4.20	708/1405	4.20	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	4	8	19	4.38	606/1504	4.38	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	12	4.36	1240/1519	4.36	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	430/1495	4.45	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	374/1459	4.81	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	727/1460	4.84	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	307/1455	4.77	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	26	4.74	397/1456	4.74	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	847/1316	3.88	3.65	4.03	4.18	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	405/1243	4.50	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	364/1241	4.71	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	366/1236	4.79	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.79

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 40
Title:	English Grammar Usage			Questionnaires: 35
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa			

Questions	NR	NA		Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	292/889	4.33	4.03	4.02	3.99	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	35	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 47
Title:	Currents In British Lit			Questionnaires: 38
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	27	4.66	413/1520	4.66	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	15	20	4.45	667/1520	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	25	4.57	483/1291	4.57	4.35	4.33	4.44	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	15	18	4.29	768/1483	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	28	4.71	186/1417	4.71	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	16	15	4.13	767/1405	4.13	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	10	22	4.42	542/1504	4.42	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	18	11	4.33	568/1495	4.33	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	33	4.86	269/1459	4.86	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	27	4.70	401/1455	4.70	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	27	4.68	490/1456	4.68	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	103/1316	4.84	3.65	4.03	4.18	4.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	339/1243	4.60	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	564/1241	4.50	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	150/1236	4.93	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	6	5	15	4.22	349/889	4.22	4.03	4.02	3.99	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 01
Title:	Currents In British Lit
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 47
Questionnaires: 38

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 35
Title:	Currents In American Lit		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Blumberg,Arnold		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	504/1520	4.59	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	16	4.34	797/1520	4.34	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	414/1291	4.63	4.35	4.33	4.44	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	427/1483	4.57	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	220/1417	4.68	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	22	4.68	227/1405	4.68	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	199/1504	4.74	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	19	6	4.11	1405/1519	4.11	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	496/1495	4.39	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	463/1459	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	218/1460	4.96	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	247/1455	4.82	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	292/1456	4.82	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	3	2	8	12	4.16	619/1316	4.16	3.65	4.03	4.18	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	284/1243	4.69	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	395/1241	4.69	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	150/1236	4.94	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.94

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 35
Title:	Currents In American Lit		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Blumberg,Arnold		

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	11	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	35
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare			Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	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	21	4.59	491/1520	4.59	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	20	4.59	457/1520	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	18	4.41	696/1291	4.41	4.35	4.33	4.44	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	1	5	17	4.22	831/1483	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	24	4.78	141/1417	4.78	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	4	19	4.33	575/1405	4.33	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	644/1504	4.35	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	1001/1519	4.63	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	377/1495	4.48	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	3	21	4.76	445/1459	4.76	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	24	4.88	596/1460	4.88	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	425/1455	4.68	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	269/1456	4.84	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	1	1	4	8	3.94	799/1316	3.94	3.65	4.03	4.18	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	200/1243	4.80	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	117/1241	4.93	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	429/1236	4.73	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	35
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare			Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	319/889	4.29	4.03	4.02	3.99	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 271 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 25**
Title: Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction		**Questionnaires: 22**
Instructor: Kenny,Meghan An		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	335/1520	4.71	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	429/1520	4.62	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	386/1291	4.67	4.35	4.33	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	222/1483	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	238/1417	4.65	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	169/1405	4.75	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	7	2	9	3.90	1101/1504	3.90	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	852/1519	4.75	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	254/1495	4.61	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	772/1459	4.56	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	596/1460	4.89	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	581/1455	4.56	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	356/1456	4.78	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	271/1243	4.70	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1241	4.80	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1236	4.90	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Kenny,Meghan An			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	26
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry			Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon				

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	10	3	3.55	1386/1520	3.55	4.10	4.31	4.36	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	8	2	3.35	1416/1520	3.35	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1136/1291	3.67	4.35	4.33	4.44	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	5	5	2	3.13	1436/1483	3.13	4.26	4.23	4.28	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	6	6	3.50	1187/1417	3.50	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	6	8	3.90	961/1405	3.90	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	8	5	2	2	1	2.06	1493/1504	2.06	3.94	4.16	4.15	2.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1342/1519	4.21	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	7	4	1	3.38	1329/1495	3.38	4.03	4.11	4.16	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	5	8	4	2	3.05	1435/1459	3.05	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	1001/1460	4.70	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	5	7	3	3.30	1363/1455	3.30	4.35	4.32	4.39	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	4	7	3.65	1269/1456	3.65	4.31	4.34	4.46	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	987/1243	3.67	4.33	4.17	4.22	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	0	2	4	3.56	1122/1241	3.56	4.40	4.33	4.38	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01		Term - Fall 2011				Enrollment: 26
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry						Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	505/1236	4.67	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carillo,John P			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	884/1520	4.43	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	834/1520	4.37	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1291	4.67	4.35	4.33	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	464/1483	4.61	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	439/1417	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	323/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1226/1504	3.77	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1360/1519	4.49	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	457/1495	4.46	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	0	5	9	4.12	1186/1459	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	326/1460	4.97	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	885/1455	4.55	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	888/1456	4.60	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/1316	4.10	3.65	4.03	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	332/1243	4.72	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	785/1241	4.61	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	476/1236	4.84	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	120/889	4.59	4.03	4.02	3.99	4.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carillo,John P			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carillo,John P		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 23
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Sawyers,Seth A			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	651/1520	4.43	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	809/1520	4.37	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1291	4.67	4.35	4.33	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	274/1483	4.61	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	632/1417	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	45/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	3	1	4	4	6	3.50	1318/1504	3.77	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	1012/1519	4.49	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	544/1495	4.46	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	552/1459	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1460	4.97	4.74	4.74	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	401/1455	4.55	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	528/1456	4.60	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1316	4.10	3.65	4.03	4.18	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	235/1243	4.72	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	324/1241	4.61	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	302/1236	4.84	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 291 02**	Term - **Fall 2011**	Enrollment: **23**
Title: **Intro Wrtg Creat Essays**		Questionnaires: **21**
Instructor: **Sawyers,Seth A**		

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	292/889	4.59	4.03	4.02	3.99	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03	Term - Fall 2011							Enrollment:	25		
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays								Questionnaires:	23		
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	7	15	4.52	581/1520	4.43	4.10	4.31	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	16	4.48	625/1520	4.37	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	386/1291	4.67	4.35	4.33	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	399/1483	4.61	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	17	4.52	346/1417	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	148/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	8	9	4.09	924/1504	3.77	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	967/1519	4.49	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	6	16	4.61	262/1495	4.46	4.03	4.11	4.16	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	498/1459	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	272/1460	4.97	4.74	4.74	4.80	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	487/1455	4.55	4.35	4.32	4.39	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	292/1456	4.60	4.31	4.34	4.46	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	674/1316	4.10	3.65	4.03	4.18	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	214/1243	4.72	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	230/1241	4.61	4.40	4.33	4.38	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1236	4.84	4.55	4.40	4.45	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	111/889	4.59	4.03	4.02	3.99	4.74

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays				Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	23
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis		Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	311/1520	4.29	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	584/1520	4.30	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1291	4.81	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	2	14	4.42	607/1483	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	255/1417	4.49	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	259/1405	4.48	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	415/1504	4.41	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	990/1519	4.11	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	790/1495	4.12	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	680/1459	4.59	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	381/1460	4.88	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	761/1455	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	14	4.63	553/1456	4.53	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	538/1316	4.19	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	372/1243	4.59	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1241	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	239/1236	4.78	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	227/889	4.48	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 300 01**	Term - **Fall 2011**	Enrollment: **23**
Title: **Comm/Tech - Analysis**		Questionnaires: **20**
Instructor: **Shipka,Jody L.**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 300 02**			**Term - Fall 2011**						**Enrollment: 23**			
Title:	**Comm/Tech - Analysis**									**Questionnaires: 17**			
Instructor:	**Maher,Jennifer**												

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	3	2	8	3.65	1348/1520	4.29	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	2	8	3.82	1235/1520	4.30	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	442/1291	4.81	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	3	9	3.88	1135/1483	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	684/1417	4.49	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	10	4.06	818/1405	4.48	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	904/1504	4.41	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	1286/1519	4.11	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	995/1495	4.12	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	1	13	4.41	953/1459	4.59	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	596/1460	4.88	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	2	9	4.06	1051/1455	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	963/1456	4.53	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	567/1316	4.19	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	372/1243	4.59	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	625/1241	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	378/1236	4.78	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 23
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Maher,Jennifer			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	334/889	4.48	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 300 03		Term - Fall 2011					Enrollment: 22				
Title: Comm/Tech - Analysis							Questionnaires: 13				
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	607/1520	4.29	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	471/1520	4.30	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1291	4.81	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	493/1483	4.27	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	229/1417	4.49	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	169/1405	4.48	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	352/1504	4.41	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1517/1519	4.11	4.57	4.70	4.69	3.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	605/1495	4.12	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	516/1459	4.59	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	779/1460	4.88	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	257/1455	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	425/1456	4.53	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	668/1316	4.19	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	298/1243	4.59	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1241	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	505/1236	4.78	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 03	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 22
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Maher,Jennifer		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	105/889	4.48	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01		Term - Fall 2011						Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang								Questionnaires: 17				
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	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	0	5	10	4.44	710/1520	4.52	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	184/1520	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	313/1291	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	493/1483	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	502/1417	4.69	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	433/1405	4.44	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	98/1504	4.02	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1360/1519	4.41	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	661/1495	4.32	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	159/1459	4.65	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1460	4.97	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	512/1455	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	725/1456	4.58	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	356/1316	4.23	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1243	4.79	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	324/1241	4.77	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	252/1236	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	559/889	4.04	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang			Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 301 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 24**	
Title: Analysis Literary Lang		**Questionnaires: 17**	
Instructor: Gwiazda,Piotr K			

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	695/1520	4.52	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	555/1520	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	851/1291	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	713/1483	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	141/1417	4.69	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	525/1405	4.44	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	904/1504	4.02	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	956/1519	4.41	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	650/1495	4.32	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	374/1459	4.65	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1460	4.97	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	425/1455	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	303/1456	4.58	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	729/1316	4.23	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	200/1243	4.79	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	344/1241	4.77	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	525/1236	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	186/889	4.04	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 301 02	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Analysis Literary Lang		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Farabaugh,Robin		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 03	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang			Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	360/1520	4.52	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	981/1520	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	730/1291	4.43	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	493/1483	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	61/1417	4.69	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	433/1405	4.44	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	7	3	1	3.08	1425/1504	4.02	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1227/1519	4.41	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	430/1495	4.32	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1108/1459	4.65	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	435/1460	4.97	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	11	1	4.00	1075/1455	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	725/1456	4.58	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1316	4.23	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	358/1243	4.79	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1241	4.77	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	589/1236	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 03		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment:	25
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang					Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael						

					Frequencies				**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	618/889	4.04	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		**Cum. GPA**		**Expected Grades**		**Reasons**		**Type**		**Majors**	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 302 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 17
Title: Lit Methodologies Resear		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Berman,Jessica		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1118/1520	4.00	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	1041/1520	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	974/1291	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	975/1483	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	338/1417	4.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	525/1405	4.38	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	770/1504	4.23	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	840/1519	4.77	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	835/1495	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	953/1459	4.42	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	903/1460	4.75	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	842/1455	4.33	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	777/1456	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1086/1316	3.44	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	849/1243	3.90	4.33	4.17	4.16	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1077/1241	3.70	4.40	4.33	4.34	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	725/1236	4.40	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 302 01**	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 17**
Title:	**Lit Methodologies Resear**		**Questionnaires: 13**
Instructor:	**Berman,Jessica**		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	411/889	4.13	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.13

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01	Term - Fall 2011							Enrollment: 25
Title:	Art Of The Essay								Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo								

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	4	10	3.95	1168/1520	3.95	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	1060/1520	4.05	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	535/1483	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	570/1417	4.30	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1101/1504	3.90	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1349/1519	4.20	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	4	3	6	3.75	1136/1495	3.75	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	1028/1459	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	596/1460	4.89	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	983/1455	4.18	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	5	10	4.22	972/1456	4.22	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	849/1243	3.90	4.33	4.17	4.16	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	922/1241	4.00	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	467/1236	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Art Of The Essay			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 21
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	167/1520	4.88	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	415/1520	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	367/1291	4.69	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	464/1483	4.53	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	53/1417	4.93	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	135/1405	4.80	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	569/1504	4.40	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1388/1519	4.13	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	508/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	534/1459	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	387/1455	4.71	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	545/1243	4.36	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	528/1241	4.55	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	534/1236	4.64	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 21
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	653/889	3.67	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 305 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 34**
Title: Brit Lit:Restor - Romant		**Questionnaires: 29**
Instructor: Smith,Orianne M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	479/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	443/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	473/1291	4.57	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	427/1483	4.57	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	80/1417	4.90	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	141/1405	4.79	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	2	21	4.54	405/1504	4.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	4.59	1045/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	496/1495	4.39	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	269/1459	4.86	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	334/1455	4.76	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	328/1456	4.79	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	3	1	0	3	4	3.36	1120/1316	3.36	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	142/1243	4.88	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	133/1241	4.92	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	86/1236	4.96	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	688/889	3.57	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 305 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 34
Title: Brit Lit:Restor - Romant		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Smith,Orianne M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 305 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment:** 34
Title: Brit Lit:Restor - Romant		**Questionnaires:** 29
Instructor: Smith,Orianne M		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 306 01**	Term - **Fall 2011**	Enrollment: **29**
Title: **Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod**		Questionnaires: **23**
Instructor: **Fernandez,Jean**		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	0	3	7	9	3.74	1312/1520	3.74	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	7	7	3.61	1347/1520	3.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	5	12	4.18	865/1291	4.18	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	831/1483	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	17	4.50	362/1417	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	5	12	4.09	798/1405	4.09	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	5	4	10	3.86	1134/1504	3.86	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	817/1519	4.78	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	3	5	7	1	3.24	1377/1495	3.24	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	0	3	15	4.33	1028/1459	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	0	2	17	4.52	1180/1460	4.52	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	3	7	8	3.86	1191/1455	3.86	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	3	11	4.05	1073/1456	4.05	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1092/1243	3.40	4.33	4.17	4.16	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	1110/1241	3.60	4.40	4.33	4.34	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	1132/1236	3.53	4.55	4.40	4.41	3.53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 306 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 29**
Title: Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod		**Questionnaires: 23**
Instructor: Fernandez,Jean		

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies** 1	2	3	4	5	**Instructor** Mean	Rank	**Course** Mean	**Org** Mean	**UMBC** Mean	**Level** Mean	**Sect** Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		**Cum. GPA**		**Expected Grades**		**Reasons**		**Type**		**Majors**	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 307 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 28
Title:	Am Lit To Civil War			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	530/1520	4.57	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	214/1520	4.78	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	395/1291	4.65	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	493/1483	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	202/1417	4.70	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	5	14	4.30	605/1405	4.30	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	581/1504	4.39	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	875/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	12	6	4.26	650/1495	4.26	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	179/1459	4.91	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	489/1460	4.91	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	361/1455	4.74	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	411/1456	4.74	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	401/1316	4.40	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	471/1243	4.44	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	520/1241	4.56	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	606/1236	4.56	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	360/889	4.20	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 307 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 28
Title:	Am Lit To Civil War			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 307 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 28
Title: Am Lit To Civil War		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: DiCuirci,Lindsa		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 23
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	681/1520	4.45	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	723/1520	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	756/1291	4.33	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	680/1483	4.36	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	211/1417	4.68	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	625/1405	4.29	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	803/1504	4.20	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	718/1495	4.20	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	199/1459	4.91	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	272/1460	4.95	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	487/1455	4.64	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	356/1456	4.77	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	187/1316	4.68	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	271/1243	4.70	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	425/1241	4.65	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	214/1236	4.90	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	404/889	4.13	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 308 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 23
Title: Am Lit After Civil War		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Gwiazda,Piotr K		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 308 01**		**Term - Fall 2011**		**Enrollment: 23**
Title:	**Am Lit After Civil War**				**Questionnaires: 22**
Instructor:	**Gwiazda,Piotr K**				

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	21
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech			Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	568/1520	4.54	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	429/1520	4.62	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	432/1291	4.62	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	564/1483	4.45	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	803/1417	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	594/1504	4.38	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	956/1519	4.67	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	324/1495	4.54	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	304/1459	4.85	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	321/1455	4.77	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	269/1456	4.85	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	405/1243	4.50	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	882/1241	4.10	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	341/1236	4.80	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 21
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech			Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	790/889	3.20	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 33
Title:	Structure Of English			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	1064/1520	4.10	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	12	4.19	948/1520	4.19	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	830/1291	4.24	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	1010/1483	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	492/1417	4.39	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1082/1405	3.74	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	737/1504	4.26	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	956/1519	4.67	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1068/1495	3.85	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	808/1459	4.53	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	596/1460	4.88	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	819/1455	4.35	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	528/1456	4.65	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1251/1316	2.83	3.65	4.03	4.08	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	660/1243	4.20	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	807/1241	4.20	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	918/1236	4.10	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 33
Title:	Structure Of English			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	709/889	3.50	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 345 01**		**Term - Fall 2011**								Enrollment:	**15**	
Title:	**Literature And History**										Questionnaires:	**12**	
Instructor:	**McKinley,Kathry**												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**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	10	4.75	288/1520	4.75	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	125/1291	4.92	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	253/1483	4.73	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	106/1417	4.83	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	169/1405	4.75	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	126/1504	4.83	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1411/1519	4.08	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	315/1495	4.55	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	616/1459	4.67	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	334/1455	4.75	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	384/1456	4.75	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	830/1316	3.91	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1243	4.82	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	354/1241	4.73	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	441/1236	4.73	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 345 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 15
Title:	Literature And History		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	220/889	4.45	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.45

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 349 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	30
Title:	The Bible And Literature		Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Osherow,Michele			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	413/1520	4.65	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	940/1520	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	414/1291	4.63	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	960/1483	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	46/1417	4.95	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	421/1405	4.47	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	859/1504	4.16	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1154/1519	4.47	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	592/1495	4.31	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	772/1459	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	272/1460	4.95	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	401/1455	4.70	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	453/1456	4.70	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	332/1243	4.62	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	385/1241	4.69	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 349 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 30
Title:	The Bible And Literature			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Osherow,Michele			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	456/889	4.00	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	1			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 364 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Persp On Women In Lit		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	517/1520	4.57	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	625/1520	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	185/1291	4.86	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	263/1483	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	119/1417	4.81	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	313/1405	4.57	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	321/1504	4.62	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1154/1519	4.48	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	508/1495	4.39	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	374/1459	4.80	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	401/1455	4.70	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	120/1456	4.95	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	480/1316	4.31	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	214/1243	4.79	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	220/1241	4.86	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	277/1236	4.86	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 364 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Persp On Women In Lit			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	319/889	4.29	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 369 01**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **30**
Title: **Race Ethnicity US Lit**		Questionnaires: **17**
Instructor: **DiCuirci,Lindsa**		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	276/1520	4.76	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	388/1520	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	337/1291	4.71	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	349/1483	4.65	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	84/1417	4.88	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	323/1405	4.56	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	12	4.47	476/1504	4.47	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	753/1519	4.82	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	457/1495	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	269/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	215/1455	4.86	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	315/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	256/1316	4.57	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	235/1243	4.75	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	230/1241	4.85	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	391/1236	4.77	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	456/889	4.00	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 369 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 30
Title:	Race Ethnicity US Lit			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 371 01**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **14**
Title: **Creative Writing-Fiction**		Questionnaires: **13**
Instructor: **Goodman,Ivy H**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	666/1520	4.46	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	981/1520	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	232/1291	4.80	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1483	4.91	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	511/1417	4.36	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	81/1405	4.92	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	848/1504	4.17	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	738/1495	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	712/1459	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	806/1460	4.80	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	637/1455	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	900/1456	4.30	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1243	4.86	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 371 01	**Term - Fall 2011**		**Enrollment: 14**
Title: Creative Writing-Fiction			**Questionnaires: 13**
Instructor: Goodman,Ivy H			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	241/889	4.43	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 373 01**	**Term - Fall 2011**		**Enrollment: 8**
Title:	**Creative Writing-Poetry**			**Questionnaires: 8**
Instructor:	**Fallon,Michael**			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	452/1520	4.63	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1291	4.25	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	222/1483	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	362/1417	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	535/1405	4.38	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	437/1504	4.50	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1393/1519	4.13	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	217/1495	4.67	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	712/1459	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	268/1455	4.80	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	516/1243	4.40	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	666/1241	4.40	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1236	4.20	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 373 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment:** 8	
Title: Creative Writing-Poetry		**Questionnaires:** 8	
Instructor: Fallon,Michael			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/889	4.00	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 19
Title:	Intro To News Writing			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1259/1520	3.83	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1241/1520	3.82	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1159/1291	3.60	4.35	4.33	4.32	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1112/1483	3.92	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1314/1417	3.17	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	445/1405	4.45	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1307/1504	3.55	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1519	4.92	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	1	3	1	3.25	1372/1495	3.25	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1199/1459	4.08	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	1195/1460	4.50	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	866/1456	4.33	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1085/1243	3.43	4.33	4.17	4.16	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1153/1241	3.43	4.40	4.33	4.34	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	1	0	3	3.43	1157/1236	3.43	4.55	4.40	4.41	3.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 19
Title:	Intro To News Writing			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	822/889	3.00	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 382 01**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **24**
Title: **Feature Writing**		Questionnaires: **17**
Instructor: **Corbett,Christo**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	651/1520	4.47	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	1086/1520	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	436/1483	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	5	8	4.00	803/1417	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	219/1405	4.69	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	0	2	7	3	3.31	1386/1504	3.31	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1154/1519	4.47	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	842/1495	4.08	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	984/1459	4.38	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	489/1460	4.92	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	748/1455	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	599/1456	4.58	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	545/1243	4.36	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	262/1241	4.82	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Feature Writing		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	360/889	4.20	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 387 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 21
Title: Web Design & Authoring		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Burgess,Helen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	581/1520	4.53	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	834/1520	4.32	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	8	4.16	906/1483	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	6	3	3	2.95	1366/1417	2.95	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	4	4	4	3.31	1274/1405	3.31	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	1	5	9	3.84	1150/1504	3.84	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1307/1519	4.26	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	790/1495	4.13	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	1108/1459	4.23	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1012/1460	4.69	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	996/1455	4.15	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1155/1456	3.92	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	919/1316	3.77	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	516/1243	4.40	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1036/1241	3.80	4.40	4.33	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	852/1236	4.20	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 387 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 21
Title: Web Design & Authoring		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Burgess,Helen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	607/1520	4.43	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	874/1520	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	185/1291	4.79	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	1	3	10	4.06	985/1483	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	3	6	3.65	1111/1417	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	334/1405	4.56	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	5	3	6	3.50	1318/1504	4.05	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1129/1519	4.60	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	605/1495	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	9	5	4.06	1207/1459	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	903/1460	4.77	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1015/1455	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1147/1456	4.36	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1316	5.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	271/1243	4.63	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	375/1241	4.61	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	341/1236	4.80	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful		9	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	186/889	4.36	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1088/1520	4.43	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	1086/1520	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	795/1291	4.79	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	874/1483	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	8	3.83	986/1417	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	913/1405	4.56	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	4	1	6	4	3.50	1318/1504	4.05	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1012/1519	4.60	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	995/1495	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	1262/1459	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	1180/1460	4.77	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1127/1455	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	5	8	4.00	1094/1456	4.36	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1316	5.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	589/1243	4.63	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	922/1241	4.61	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	725/1236	4.80	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/889	4.36	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 391 02**					**Term - Fall 2011**								**Enrollment: 24**
Title:	**Adv Expos & Argument**													**Questionnaires: 18**
Instructor:	**McGurrin,Anthon**													

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 391 02	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 24**
Title: Adv Expos & Argument		**Questionnaires: 18**
Instructor: McGurrin,Anthon		

| Questions | NR | NA | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 391 03**	**Term - Fall 2011**		**Enrollment: 24**
Title:	**Adv Expos & Argument**			**Questionnaires: 20**
Instructor:	**Macek,Philip M.**			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	725/1520	4.43	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	555/1520	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1291	4.79	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	3	13	4.42	607/1483	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	6	6	3.63	1118/1417	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	183/1405	4.56	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	726/1504	4.05	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	875/1519	4.60	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	351/1495	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	664/1459	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	845/1460	4.77	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	487/1455	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	683/1456	4.36	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1316	5.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	405/1243	4.63	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	324/1241	4.61	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1236	4.80	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 391 03**		**Term - Fall 2011**		**Enrollment: 24**
Title:	**Adv Expos & Argument**				**Questionnaires: 20**
Instructor:	**Macek,Philip M.**				

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	688/889	4.36	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	311/1520	4.43	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1291	4.79	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	74/1483	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	171/1417	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1405	4.56	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	54/1504	4.05	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1055/1519	4.60	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1495	4.43	4.03	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1459	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1460	4.77	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1455	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1456	4.36	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1316	5.00	3.65	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1243	4.63	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	4.61	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1236	4.80	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/889	4.36	4.03	4.02	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 392 01**	**Term - Fall 2011**		Enrollment:	**4**
Title:	**Tutorial In Writing**			Questionnaires:	**4**
Instructor:	**Fitzpatrick,Car**				

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	924/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	493/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	362/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	190/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	351/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	312/1316	4.50	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	5.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.72	4.55	4.35	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/62	5.00	4.86	4.54	4.55	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/68	5.00	4.75	4.59	4.63	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/66	4.00	4.03	4.20	4.14	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	838/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	809/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1291	4.83	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1395/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	656/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	956/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	891/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	616/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	842/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	866/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	729/1316	4.50	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 02	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	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	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
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	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1291	4.83	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 04	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	584/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	999/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1435/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	351/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 04		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing					Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 05	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1118/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1086/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	974/1291	4.83	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1010/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1348/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	843/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1432/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1129/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1288/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1230/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1394/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1075/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	729/1316	4.50	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	766/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	947/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 05
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	456/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 06	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1348/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1432/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	891/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 06
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 2

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires:	3
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	360/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	803/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	351/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	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	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 08		Term - Fall 2011							Enrollment: 2				
Title:	Tutorial In Writing									Questionnaires: 2				
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael													

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	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	607/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	584/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1291	4.83	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1435/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	351/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 08	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 2
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	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	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 392 09**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **3**
Title: **Tutorial In Writing**		Questionnaires: **3**
Instructor: **Porter,Jane**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	399/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	493/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1417/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	843/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	568/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 09	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Porter,Jane		

| | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	456/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 10	Term - Fall 2011						Enrollment: 3				
Title:	Tutorial In Writing							Questionnaires: 3				
Instructor:	Porter,Jane											

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1291	4.83	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	362/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.50	3.65	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 10	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Porter,Jane		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	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	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 11	Term - Fall 2011								Enrollment: 3			
Title:	Tutorial In Writing									Questionnaires: 3			
Instructor:	Porter,Jane												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	399/1520	4.61	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1291	4.83	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	540/1417	3.54	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.77	4.30	4.12	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	656/1504	4.22	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	568/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	4.87	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1460	4.90	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1455	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	503/1456	4.80	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.50	3.65	4.03	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1243	4.91	4.33	4.17	4.16	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	4.91	4.40	4.33	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	4.91	4.55	4.40	4.41	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 11	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 3**
Title: Tutorial In Writing		**Questionnaires: 3**
Instructor: Porter,Jane		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/889	4.78	4.03	4.02	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 393 01**	**Term - Fall 2011**								Enrollment:	**25**
Title:	**Technical Communication**									Questionnaires:	**18**
Instructor:	**Sly-Thompson,Al**										

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	9	2	1	5	1	2.28	1514/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	2.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	1	5	4	2.94	1486/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	4	0	3	2	1	2.60	1283/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	2.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	0	3	3	6	3.17	1429/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	7	4	2	2.94	1366/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	4	4	4	3.11	1320/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	5	5	3.56	1305/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	733/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	4	4	1	0	2.07	1492/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	2.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	2	1	5	3	2.94	1444/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	2.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	1	4	3	5	3.38	1454/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	2	3	3	4	2.94	1410/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	1	1	2	4	2.47	1445/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	2.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1276/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	0	1	3	2	2.90	1204/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	989/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1077/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Sly-Thompson,Al			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	3	1	0	3	1	2.75	865/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 02	**Term - Fall 2011**		**Enrollment: 25**
Title: Technical Communication			**Questionnaires: 18**
Instructor: Porter,Jane			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	838/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	809/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	274/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	6	4	3.28	1277/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	235/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	904/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	632/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	718/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	234/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	184/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	370/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	587/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 393 02**		**Term - Fall 2011**								**Enrollment: 25**
Title:	**Technical Communication**										**Questionnaires: 18**
Instructor:	**Porter,Jane**										

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 03	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Harris,Linda R		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	3	3	3	3.00	1498/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	2	1	2.94	1488/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1183/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1399/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	1136/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	5	3	1	2.69	1466/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	2.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1066/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1415/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1273/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1381/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	5	2	3.57	1300/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1311/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	819/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 03	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	814/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	513/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	166/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	336/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	743/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	506/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	631/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	852/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1217/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	984/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1108/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	1	12	4.35	819/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	3	11	4.11	1052/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	635/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	766/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	842/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	398/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 04	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 25**
Title: Technical Communication		**Questionnaires: 20**
Instructor: Hess,Laurie		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 393 05**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **25**
Title: **Technical Communication**		Questionnaires: **16**
Instructor: **Harris,Linda R**		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1421/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	5	5	3.67	1320/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	1183/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1125/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	1127/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	2	2	4	3.07	1425/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1163/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1217/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1230/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1379/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1153/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1163/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	587/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 05	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Harris,Linda R		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 393 06**	**Term - Fall 2011**		Enrollment:	**25**
Title:	**Technical Communication**			Questionnaires:	**19**
Instructor:	**Murray,William**				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	5	5	3.63	1352/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	1022/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	949/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	789/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	7	3.79	1022/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	843/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	3	4	8	3.84	1150/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1304/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	664/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1084/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	736/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	981/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	6	0	3	3.50	1057/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	652/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	748/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	525/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Murray,William					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	7	2	4	3.57	688/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 393 07**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **26**
Title: **Technical Communication**		Questionnaires: **20**
Instructor: **Walters,April I**		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	4	4	4	3.21	1482/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	7	7	3.70	1302/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	6	5	3.30	1400/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	4	7	3.55	1163/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	7	7	3.75	1071/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	6	3	2	3	2.58	1475/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	2.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	15	3	3.95	1461/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	3.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	10	3	2	3.38	1333/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1308/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	1024/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	1253/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	5	5	3.59	1291/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	4	2	5	7	3.83	871/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	692/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1021/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	878/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	158/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 393 07**		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: **26**
Title: **Technical Communication**					Questionnaires: **20**
Instructor: **Walters,April I**					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Technical Communication				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Walters,April I				

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 08	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Carbone,Christo		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	13	3	3.80	1277/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	847/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	399/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	8	5	5	3.65	1104/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	656/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	4	6	3.65	1268/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	592/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	12	4	4.00	891/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	10	6	3.95	1257/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	1120/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	996/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	11	5	3.90	1171/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	2	7	0	3.36	1120/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	567/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	837/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	615/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.55

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Carbone,Christo		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	186/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 393 09**	Term - **Fall 2011**	Enrollment: **25**
Title: **Technical Communication**		Questionnaires: **18**
Instructor: **Carbone,Christo**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1178/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	584/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	795/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	658/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	986/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	235/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	4.17	848/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	753/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	780/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	808/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	962/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	614/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	1015/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1131/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	766/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	239/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Carbone,Christo		

Questions			Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful		9	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	186/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	James,Annie D			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	1	4	3.15	1490/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	2	4	3.31	1428/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1064/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	2	4	3.62	1276/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1132/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1103/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	4	0	4	3.08	1425/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	733/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	5	1	2	3	3.27	1367/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1382/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1360/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1253/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	5	0	3	3.00	1402/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	3	1	1	1	3	3.00	1210/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	25
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	James,Annie D			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	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	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 393 11**	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 23**
Title:	**Technical Communication**		**Questionnaires: 18**
Instructor:	**Meade,Vicki L**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	2	5	4	3.17	1488/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	8	4.17	972/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	2	8	3.72	1225/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	2	1	2	6	3.00	1348/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1127/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	3	11	4.22	781/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1045/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1321/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	648/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	1135/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	819/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	6	8	4.00	1094/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	698/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	724/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	23
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires:	18
Instructor:	Meade,Vicki L				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	632/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 393 12**		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: **26**
Title: **Technical Communication**				Questionnaires: **10**
Instructor: **Murray,William**				

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	1	0	2.40	1513/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	2.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1404/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1182/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1307/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	3	1	3.20	1304/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1306/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	2	0	3	3.38	1365/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	1129/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	0	0	2.83	1454/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	1455/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	2.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1448/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	1393/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1440/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1281/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1234/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1206/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1173/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	884/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	2.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 12		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 26

Title:	Technical Communication					Questionnaires: 10

Instructor:	Murray,William

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.03	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 12	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 10
Instructor:	Murray,William			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 13	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 24
Title: Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Hinc,Danuta Ewa		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	5	7	3.67	1341/1520	3.42	4.10	4.31	4.33	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	4	7	3.57	1356/1520	3.81	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1284/1291	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.32	2.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	4	8	3.48	1345/1483	3.93	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	7	3	6	3.45	1206/1417	3.42	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	1	10	3.75	1071/1405	3.88	4.30	4.12	4.13	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	5	6	4	3.37	1369/1504	3.54	3.94	4.16	4.15	3.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	8	11	1	3.57	1510/1519	4.59	4.57	4.70	4.69	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1159/1495	3.44	4.03	4.11	4.07	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	7	4	6	3.50	1386/1459	3.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	1303/1460	4.34	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	6	4	4	3.41	1343/1455	3.93	4.35	4.32	4.31	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	4	7	3.68	1258/1456	3.69	4.31	4.34	4.32	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	3	6	8	3.95	789/1316	3.58	3.65	4.03	4.08	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	5	5	3.61	1015/1243	3.74	4.33	4.17	4.16	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	874/1241	4.16	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	989/1236	4.23	4.55	4.40	4.41	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	738/889	3.72	4.03	4.02	4.02	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 13	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Hinc,Danuta Ewa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.84	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.72	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/62	****	4.86	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	4.75	4.59	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 13	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Hinc,Danuta Ewa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01	Term - Fall 2011								Enrollment:	19
Title:	Internship in Tutoring W									Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary										

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	504/1520	4.59	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	237/1520	4.76	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	13	4.53	474/1483	4.53	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	632/1417	4.24	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	555/1405	4.35	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	999/1504	4.00	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	632/1519	4.88	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	982/1495	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	1011/1459	4.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	753/1460	4.81	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	885/1455	4.45	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	1073/1456	4.20	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	1281/1316	2.46	3.65	4.03	4.08	2.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	624/1243	4.25	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	604/1241	4.47	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	725/1236	4.40	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment:	19
Title:	Internship in Tutoring W		Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	385/889	4.17	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment: 19
Title:	Internship in Tutoring W			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	504/1520	4.59	4.10	4.31	4.33	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	237/1520	4.76	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	13	4.53	474/1483	4.53	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	632/1417	4.24	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	555/1405	4.35	4.30	4.12	4.13	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	999/1504	4.00	3.94	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	632/1519	4.88	4.57	4.70	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	842/1495	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	712/1459	4.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	806/1460	4.81	4.74	4.74	4.72	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	525/1455	4.45	4.35	4.32	4.31	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	866/1456	4.20	4.31	4.34	4.32	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1291/1316	2.46	3.65	4.03	4.08	2.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	624/1243	4.25	4.33	4.17	4.16	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	604/1241	4.47	4.40	4.33	4.34	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	725/1236	4.40	4.55	4.40	4.41	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 395 01**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **19**
Title: **Internship in Tutoring W**		Questionnaires: **17**
Instructor: **Fitzpatrick,Car**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	385/889	4.17	4.03	4.02	4.02	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01	Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment:	24
Title:	Method Of Interpretation				Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean					

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	479/1520	4.60	4.10	4.31	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	1022/1520	4.10	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	696/1291	4.40	4.35	4.33	4.38	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	12	6	4.16	906/1483	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.33	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	473/1417	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	750/1405	4.15	4.30	4.12	4.25	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1184/1504	3.80	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1129/1519	4.50	4.57	4.70	4.70	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	801/1495	4.13	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	772/1459	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	1001/1460	4.70	4.74	4.74	4.78	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	877/1455	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	516/1456	4.65	4.31	4.34	4.41	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1274/1316	2.60	3.65	4.03	4.12	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	504/1243	4.41	4.33	4.17	4.42	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	6	9	4.24	785/1241	4.24	4.40	4.33	4.56	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	797/1236	4.31	4.55	4.40	4.64	4.31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01
Title:	Method Of Interpretation
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 20

| | | | | | | | | | Frequencies | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion																	
4. Were special techniques successful					3	13	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 405 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	12
Title:	Seminar In Literary Hist			Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	140/1520	4.91	4.10	4.31	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	283/1520	4.73	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	636/1483	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1417	5.00	4.00	4.08	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	961/1405	3.91	4.30	4.12	4.25	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1101/1504	3.91	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	773/1519	4.82	4.57	4.70	4.70	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	130/1495	4.80	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	967/1459	4.40	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	761/1455	4.40	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.31	4.34	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1298/1316	2.33	3.65	4.03	4.12	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1243	4.89	4.33	4.17	4.42	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	378/1236	4.78	4.55	4.40	4.64	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	571/889	3.86	4.03	4.02	4.26	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 405 01		Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	12
Title:	Seminar In Literary Hist				Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	38/67	4.71	4.84	4.60	4.59	4.71
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.72	4.55	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/62	5.00	4.86	4.54	4.60	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	24/68	4.86	4.75	4.59	4.56	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	34/66	4.14	4.03	4.20	4.19	4.14

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 407 01**	**Term - Fall 2011**	Enrollment: **13**
Title: **Language In Society**		Questionnaires: **10**
Instructor: **Shipka,Jody L.**		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1520	4.70	4.10	4.31	4.44	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	584/1520	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	399/1483	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	264/1417	4.63	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	169/1405	4.75	4.30	4.12	4.25	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	311/1504	4.63	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	520/1495	4.38	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	234/1459	4.89	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1455	4.67	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1456	4.89	4.31	4.34	4.41	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	169/1316	4.71	3.65	4.03	4.12	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.33	4.17	4.42	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.55	4.40	4.64	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	85/889	4.83	4.03	4.02	4.26	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment:	13
Title:	Language In Society					Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.						

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/67	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.59	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.72	4.55	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/62	5.00	4.86	4.54	4.60	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/68	5.00	4.75	4.59	4.56	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	38/66	4.00	4.03	4.20	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 442 01	Term - Fall 2011								Enrollment:	15		
Title:	Visual Literacy									Questionnaires:	12		
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J												

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	802/1520	4.36	4.10	4.31	4.44	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	874/1520	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1291	4.75	4.35	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	493/1483	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	330/1417	4.55	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	445/1405	4.45	4.30	4.12	4.25	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1232/1504	3.73	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	351/1495	4.50	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	637/1455	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	683/1456	4.50	4.31	4.34	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	256/1316	4.57	3.65	4.03	4.12	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1243	4.89	4.33	4.17	4.42	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	415/1241	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.56	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	378/1236	4.78	4.55	4.40	4.64	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	78/889	4.88	4.03	4.02	4.26	4.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 442 01
Title:	Visual Literacy
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/67	4.75	4.84	4.60	4.59	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	43/66	4.50	4.72	4.55	4.60	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	29/62	4.75	4.86	4.54	4.60	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	54/68	4.25	4.75	4.59	4.56	4.25
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	38/66	4.00	4.03	4.20	4.19	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	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 448 01	Term - Fall 2011		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Seminar In Lit & Culture			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	399/1520	4.67	4.10	4.31	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	11	4.40	723/1520	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	909/1291	4.13	4.35	4.33	4.38	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	842/1483	4.21	4.26	4.23	4.33	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	171/1417	4.73	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	283/1405	4.60	4.30	4.12	4.25	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	940/1504	4.07	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1519	4.93	4.57	4.70	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	351/1495	4.50	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	1078/1459	4.27	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	525/1455	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	683/1456	4.50	4.31	4.34	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	298/1243	4.67	4.33	4.17	4.42	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	415/1241	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.56	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	606/1236	4.56	4.55	4.40	4.64	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 448 01		Term - Fall 2011			Enrollment: 16
Title:	Seminar In Lit & Culture					Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	30/67	4.89	4.84	4.60	4.59	4.89
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	54/66	4.11	4.72	4.55	4.60	4.11
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	40/62	4.56	4.86	4.54	4.60	4.56
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	39/68	4.67	4.75	4.59	4.56	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	38/66	4.00	4.03	4.20	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: **ENGL 471 01**	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: **11**
Title: **Adv Creative Wrtng:Fictn**		Questionnaires: **11**
Instructor: **Shivnan,Sally A**		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	802/1520	4.36	4.10	4.31	4.44	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	527/1520	4.55	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1291	4.50	4.35	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	446/1483	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	282/1417	4.60	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	135/1405	4.80	4.30	4.12	4.25	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	331/1504	4.60	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	661/1495	4.25	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	534/1459	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1456	4.86	4.31	4.34	4.41	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	3.65	4.03	4.12	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1243	****	4.33	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.40	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.55	4.40	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 471 01	**Term - Fall 2011**	**Enrollment: 11**
Title: Adv Creative Wrtng:Fictn		**Questionnaires: 11**
Instructor: Shivnan,Sally A		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 486 01**		**Term - Fall 2011**							**Enrollment: 8**				
Title:	**Seminar In Teaching Comp**									**Questionnaires: 5**				
Instructor:	**Shipka,Jody L.**													

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies**					**Instructor**		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	479/1520	4.60	4.10	4.31	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1086/1520	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1291	****	4.35	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1417	5.00	4.00	4.08	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1405	4.80	4.30	4.12	4.25	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	331/1504	4.60	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	661/1495	4.25	4.03	4.11	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.74	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	637/1455	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1456	4.60	4.31	4.34	4.41	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1268/1316	2.67	3.65	4.03	4.12	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	200/1243	4.80	4.33	4.17	4.42	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.40	4.33	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.55	4.40	4.64	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 486 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 8
Title:	Seminar In Teaching Comp		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful		0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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