

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1007/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	830/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	819/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	781/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	827/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	337/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	739/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	970/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1082/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	3.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	614/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1058/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1053/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1205/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	2.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1099/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	857/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1013/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	200/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	758/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	724/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	686/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	613/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	717/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	476/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	633/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	687/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	550/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	989/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	838/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	796/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	633/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	989/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	3.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	240/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	479/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	200/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3 C 3	General	14	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	309/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	269/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	224/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	103/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	117/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	449/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	421/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	68/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	568/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	425/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	199/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	253/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	709/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	170/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.57

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.63	4.25	4.42	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	3.44	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	4.64	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

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	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	821/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	354/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	258/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	483/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	112/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	687/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	1095/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	304/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	568/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	684/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	919/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	567/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	709/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	303/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	557/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	287/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.33



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0 General 6	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	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 100 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	758/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	425/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	519/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	339/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	232/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	263/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	633/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	7	4.29	1190/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	177/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.72
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	691/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	518/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	567/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	283/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	631/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	257/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	643/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	3.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 13 Required for Majors	3 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2 General	16	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	796/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	479/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	619/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	444/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	530/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	0	10	4.43	500/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	411/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1111/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	568/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	855/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	199/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	135/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	980/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	353/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	222/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	269/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	114/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.71

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 06
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 8 Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1 General	9	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	4	1	1	2.58	1442/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	2.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1285/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	784/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1086/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	827/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	7	1	3	3.64	1075/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1278/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	3.50	1432/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	1393/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	2.86
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	4	2	2	2	3.00	1362/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1295/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1251/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1222/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	2	1	0	3	2.60	1202/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	2.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1088/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1105/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1104/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	681/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	3.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	12

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	440/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	644/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	859/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1018/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	524/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	970/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1245/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	707/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1290/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	946/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	786/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	436/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	6

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	0	7	8	4.11	1037/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	112/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	164/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	648/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	385/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	0	14	4.53	459/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1183/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	527/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	237/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	319/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	211/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	836/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.83
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	475/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	404/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	190/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	300/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.30

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/196	****	4.63	4.25	4.42	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	3.44	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	4.64	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	18

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	5	1	2	2.71	1436/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	2.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	1	1	2.64	1433/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1147/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1353/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	7	1	1	2.91	1320/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	2.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1229/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	2	4	0	2	2.29	1422/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	2.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1282/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	5	2	0	2.80	1399/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	2.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	3	4	0	1	2.36	1380/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	2.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	1238/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	1	5	1	1	2.64	1367/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	2.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1363/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	2.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1012/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	857/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 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 1	C 2 General	6	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 3	0	Electives 0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 11
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	12	4	3.90	1187/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	354/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	408/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	460/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	173/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	633/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1041/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	573/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	691/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	659/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	187/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	445/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	256/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	232/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	264/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	183/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.55

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 11
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Spring 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
Discussion														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	11	8	4.13	1027/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	297/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	504/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	827/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	290/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	709/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	977/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	448/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.43
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	630/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	607/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	5	16	4.42	756/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	793/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	9	11	4.32	508/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	371/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	584/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	316/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	200/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	24

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	22	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	486/1449	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	56/1446	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	182/1256	4.49	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	164/1402	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	302/1358	4.19	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	217/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	99/1435	4.18	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1041/1446	4.43	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	829/1437	4.11	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.07
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	462/1386	4.35	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	607/1390	4.74	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	163/1379	4.33	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	211/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	436/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	335/1121	4.21	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	370/1122	4.41	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	211/1121	4.52	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	347/790	4.27	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.22

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10 Required for Majors	4 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1 General	9	Under-grad 17 Non-major 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	847/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	745/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	734/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	460/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	611/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	868/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	918/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	504/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	660/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	319/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	611/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	717/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	921/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	422/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	421/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	304/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	369/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.19

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 2 Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 4 General	12	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	7	4.14	1007/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	610/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	829/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	578/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	524/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	818/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	898/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	550/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	371/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	659/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	504/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	666/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	777/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	529/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	370/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	328/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	3	6	9	4.00	425/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1 B 9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 5	General	18	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 to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	663/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	841/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	749/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	270/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	608/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	281/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	247/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	918/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	868/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	553/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	761/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	702/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	737/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	591/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	365/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	691/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	557/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	590/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/200	4.55	4.55	4.28	4.19	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/205	4.44	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	88/201	4.47	4.47	4.51	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/202	4.69	4.69	4.42	4.55	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/196	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.42	5.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	4.75	4.87	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	4.75	4.92	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	4.50	4.68	4.00	3.44	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/34	4.25	4.25	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	4.75	4.75	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	4.63	4.75	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	4.75	4.75	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	4.00	4.50	4.34	4.64	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

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	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	4.00	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	4.25	4.63	4.07	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Goodwin,David C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	594/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	492/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	619/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	528/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	746/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	253/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	644/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1296/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	417/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	1045/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	906/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	770/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	655/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	591/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	587/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	479/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	169/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	183/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.55

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Goodwin,David C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/200	4.55	4.55	4.28	4.19	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	27/205	4.44	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	58/201	4.47	4.47	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	48/202	4.69	4.69	4.42	4.55	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/196	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.42	4.75
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/66	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.35	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/64	4.75	4.87	4.25	4.01	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	18/75	4.75	4.92	4.32	3.95	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	17/73	4.50	4.68	4.00	3.44	4.75
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	24/34	4.25	4.25	4.33	2.63	4.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/35	5.00	5.00	4.15	5.00	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	10/30	4.75	4.75	4.04	4.75	4.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	18/31	4.63	4.75	4.34	4.82	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/18	4.75	4.75	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/24	4.00	4.50	4.34	4.64	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Goodwin,David C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
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														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	4.00	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	4.25	4.63	4.07	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	860/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	425/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	458/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	224/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	727/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	748/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	313/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1275/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	713/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.18
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	568/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	425/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	199/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	567/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	709/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	240/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	857/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	590/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	13

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	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	4.55	4.55	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	4.44	4.44	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	4.47	4.47	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	4.69	4.69	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.42	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Carillo,John P

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	594/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	354/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	179/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	232/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	404/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	970/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1151/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	155/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	462/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	385/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	4.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 19
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Carillo,John P

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

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

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harvey,Jonathan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	594/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	121/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	190/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	129/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	345/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	138/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	107/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	368/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	226/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	371/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	633/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	343/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	118/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1098/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	3.27
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	377/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	512/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	311/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	4.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Harvey,Jonathan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	120/200	4.55	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/205	4.44	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	168/201	4.47	4.47	4.51	4.57	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	48/202	4.69	4.69	4.42	4.55	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	68/196	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.42	4.50
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	4.75	4.87	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/75	4.75	4.92	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	35/73	4.50	4.68	4.00	3.44	4.25
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/34	4.25	4.25	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	4.75	4.75	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	4.63	4.75	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	4.75	4.75	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	4.00	4.50	4.34	4.64	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 22	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 16												
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 16												
Instructor: Harvey,Jonathan														
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Self Paced														

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 25
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	938/1449	4.37	4.19	4.33	4.14	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	677/1446	4.53	4.26	4.29	4.20	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	519/1256	4.66	4.41	4.34	4.21	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	976/1402	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.10	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	9	4.14	737/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.04	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	500/1327	4.49	4.39	4.16	3.92	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	808/1435	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.11	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	1240/1446	4.46	4.59	4.67	4.57	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	638/1437	4.38	4.06	4.12	4.04	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	691/1386	4.66	4.44	4.48	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1025/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.67	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	635/1379	4.60	4.36	4.34	4.28	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	611/1379	4.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	3	0	2	3.00	1144/1236	3.89	3.75	4.08	3.93	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	431/1121	4.52	4.39	4.18	3.89	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	378/1122	4.56	4.52	4.36	4.09	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	281/1121	4.83	4.64	4.40	4.08	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	731/790	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.89	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 25
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	153/200	4.55	4.55	4.28	4.19	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	175/205	4.44	4.44	4.29	4.37	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	162/201	4.47	4.47	4.51	4.57	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	154/202	4.69	4.69	4.42	4.55	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	124/196	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.42	4.25
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/66	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	4.75	4.87	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/75	4.75	4.92	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/73	4.50	4.68	4.00	3.44	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/34	4.25	4.25	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/35	5.00	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/30	4.75	4.75	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	15/31	4.63	4.75	4.34	4.82	4.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	6/18	4.75	4.75	4.13	4.88	4.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	17/24	4.00	4.50	4.34	4.64	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 25
Title:	Composition
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	14

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	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	9/15	4.00	4.50	4.18	4.50	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	7/13	4.25	4.63	4.07	4.63	4.25

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01
Title:	Composition ESL Students
Instructor:	Rollins,John V

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	8	1	3.32	1393/1449	3.32	4.19	4.33	4.14	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	8	2	3.47	1336/1446	3.47	4.26	4.29	4.20	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	3	8	3.95	984/1256	3.95	4.41	4.34	4.21	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	4	3.79	1158/1402	3.79	4.39	4.27	4.10	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	8	2	3.32	1240/1358	3.32	4.15	4.13	4.04	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	9	4	3.68	1052/1327	3.68	4.39	4.16	3.92	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	4	8	2	3.39	1301/1435	3.39	4.01	4.20	4.11	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	3.74	1419/1446	3.74	4.59	4.67	4.57	3.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	7	1	3.50	1245/1437	3.50	4.06	4.12	4.04	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	7	6	3	3.50	1319/1386	3.50	4.44	4.48	4.40	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1356/1390	3.79	4.77	4.74	4.67	3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	9	4	3.83	1157/1379	3.83	4.36	4.34	4.28	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	6	4	3.61	1228/1379	3.61	4.34	4.36	4.26	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	1095/1236	3.29	3.75	4.08	3.93	3.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	888/1121	3.64	4.39	4.18	3.89	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	998/1122	3.57	4.52	4.36	4.09	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	967/1121	3.71	4.64	4.40	4.08	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	632/790	3.54	4.07	4.06	3.89	3.54

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01
Title:	Composition ESL Students
Instructor:	Rollins,John V

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.63	4.25	4.42	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	3.44	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	4.63	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	23
Title:	Composition ESL Students		Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Rollins,John V			

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 01
Title:	Introduction To Lit
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	10	21	4.35	796/1449	4.35	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	25	4.62	411/1446	4.62	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	27	4.70	324/1256	4.70	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	304/1402	4.69	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	34	4.89	83/1358	4.89	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	375/1327	4.54	4.39	4.16	4.12	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	33	4.86	115/1435	4.86	4.01	4.20	4.17	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	752/1446	4.78	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	279/1437	4.60	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.44	4.48	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	160/1390	4.97	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	33	4.91	114/1379	4.91	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	197/1379	4.89	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	4	25	4.74	166/1236	4.74	3.75	4.08	4.16	4.74
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	377/1121	4.53	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	455/1122	4.60	4.52	4.36	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.64	4.40	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	300/790	4.30	4.07	4.06	4.01	4.30

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 210 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 49
Title: Introduction To Lit		Questionnaires: 37
Instructor: Rockett,Danika		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01
Title:	English Grammar Usage
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	12	14	4.26	903/1449	4.26	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	219/1446	4.77	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	157/1256	4.87	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	339/1402	4.67	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	10	12	4.10	776/1358	4.10	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	2	2	9	7	4.05	819/1327	4.05	4.39	4.16	4.12	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	449/1435	4.53	4.01	4.20	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	19	11	4.37	1127/1446	4.37	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	606/1437	4.28	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	371/1386	4.80	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	29	4.93	372/1390	4.93	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	302/1379	4.77	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	385/1379	4.76	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	21	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1113/1236	3.22	3.75	4.08	4.16	3.22
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	431/1121	4.46	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	512/1122	4.54	4.52	4.36	4.34	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	704/1121	4.38	4.64	4.40	4.39	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	341/790	4.23	4.07	4.06	4.01	4.23

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01
Title:	English Grammar Usage
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	32

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	4
			P 1		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 2		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 01
Title:	Currents In British Lit
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	635/1449	4.48	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	368/1446	4.65	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	236/1256	4.78	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	504/1402	4.52	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	98/1358	4.87	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	533/1327	4.39	4.39	4.16	4.12	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	325/1435	4.65	4.01	4.20	4.17	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	14	7	4.22	1240/1446	4.22	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	304/1437	4.57	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	425/1386	4.77	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	288/1379	4.77	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	85/1379	4.95	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	893/1236	3.79	3.75	4.08	4.16	3.79
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	351/1122	4.73	4.52	4.36	4.34	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	316/1121	4.82	4.64	4.40	4.39	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	545/790	3.80	4.07	4.06	4.01	3.80



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 241 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 37
Title: Currents In British Lit		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Smith,Orianne M		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01
Title:	Currents In American Lit
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	0	6	9	12	3.81	1237/1449	3.81	4.19	4.33	4.32	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	6	16	4.17	953/1446	4.17	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	3	6	18	4.34	707/1256	4.34	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	6	4	18	4.43	641/1402	4.43	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	177/1358	4.73	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	7	17	4.33	591/1327	4.33	4.39	4.16	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	8	5	16	4.17	858/1435	4.17	4.01	4.20	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	211/1446	4.97	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	4	13	7	3.92	986/1437	3.92	4.06	4.12	4.10	3.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	6	20	4.67	614/1386	4.67	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	425/1390	4.93	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	10	17	4.63	491/1379	4.63	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	677/1379	4.52	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1071/1236	3.36	3.75	4.08	4.16	3.36
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	198/1121	4.76	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	191/1122	4.88	4.52	4.36	4.34	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	304/1121	4.82	4.64	4.40	4.39	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	1	1	1	0	8	4.18	369/790	4.18	4.07	4.06	4.01	4.18

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01
Title:	Currents In American Lit
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	32

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8 Required for Majors	5 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 2 General	10	Under-grad 32 Non-major
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	1	
			? 6		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare
Instructor:	Osherow, Michele

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	649/1449	4.46	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	10	4.08	1022/1446	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	3	17	4.35	707/1256	4.35	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	7	6	10	3.88	1105/1402	3.88	4.39	4.27	4.28	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	19	4.62	276/1358	4.62	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	8	9	3.81	992/1327	3.81	4.39	4.16	4.12	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	6	9	7	3.73	1173/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.17	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	776/1446	4.77	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	2	10	8	3.88	1035/1437	3.88	4.06	4.12	4.10	3.88
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	903/1386	4.42	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	6	15	4.36	805/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	6	17	4.38	800/1379	4.38	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	695/1236	4.05	3.75	4.08	4.16	4.05
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	637/1121	4.20	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	691/1122	4.33	4.52	4.36	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	731/1121	4.33	4.64	4.40	4.39	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	413/790	4.07	4.07	4.06	4.01	4.07

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare
Instructor:	Osherow, Michele

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	2.63	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	3.25	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction
Instructor:	Linder,Deborah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	376/1449	4.67	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	899/1256	4.09	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	396/1402	4.62	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	8	11	4.29	598/1358	4.29	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	173/1327	4.76	4.39	4.16	4.12	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	687/1435	4.33	4.01	4.20	4.17	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	526/1446	4.90	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	459/1437	4.41	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.41
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	498/1386	4.74	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	319/1390	4.95	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	553/1379	4.58	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	666/1379	4.53	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1236	****	3.75	4.08	4.16	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	114/1121	4.90	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	211/1121	4.90	4.64	4.40	4.39	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	522/790	3.86	4.07	4.06	4.01	3.86

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 271 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 25
Title: Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Linder,Deborah			

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1 General 3	Under-grad 21	Non-major 20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives 10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 1		
			I 0 Other 1		
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	5	5	0	2.65	1440/1449	2.65	4.19	4.33	4.32	2.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	5	1	3	2.65	1433/1446	2.65	4.26	4.29	4.27	2.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1256	****	4.41	4.34	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	4	3	3	1	2.77	1381/1402	2.77	4.39	4.27	4.28	2.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	2	5	3	3.27	1255/1358	3.27	4.15	4.13	4.13	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	956/1327	3.87	4.39	4.16	4.12	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	4	3	1	3	1	2.50	1415/1435	2.50	4.01	4.20	4.17	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1335/1446	4.06	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	3	4	5	1	0	2.31	1429/1437	2.31	4.06	4.12	4.10	2.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	4	4	2	1	2.69	1377/1386	2.69	4.44	4.48	4.46	2.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	1230/1390	4.38	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	2	5	1	2	2.77	1356/1379	2.77	4.36	4.34	4.31	2.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	2	3	1	2.46	1371/1379	2.46	4.34	4.36	4.37	2.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	****	3.75	4.08	4.16	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1120/1121	1.60	4.39	4.18	4.11	1.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1107/1122	2.60	4.52	4.36	4.34	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/1121	****	4.64	4.40	4.39	****

### Frequency Distribution



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 273 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 30
Title: Int Creative Wtg-Poetry		Questionnaires: 17
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
Discussion														

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	5	14	4.55	527/1449	4.54	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	637/1446	4.44	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	400/1256	4.82	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	408/1402	4.64	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	371/1358	4.15	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	356/1327	4.60	4.39	4.16	4.12	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	6	11	4.20	818/1435	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	788/1446	4.79	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	470/1437	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	583/1386	4.57	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	1036/1390	4.81	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	553/1379	4.41	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	2	15	4.53	666/1379	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	492/1236	3.57	3.75	4.08	4.16	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	102/1121	4.66	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1122	4.84	4.52	4.36	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1121	4.82	4.64	4.40	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/790	4.59	4.07	4.06	4.01	4.91

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache				

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 21 Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Sawyers,Seth A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	594/1449	4.54	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	819/1446	4.44	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1256	4.82	4.41	4.34	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	528/1402	4.64	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	827/1358	4.15	4.15	4.13	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	662/1327	4.60	4.39	4.16	4.12	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	3	3	2	6	3.60	1242/1435	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.17	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1446	4.79	4.59	4.67	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	822/1437	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.07
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	691/1386	4.57	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	684/1390	4.81	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1030/1379	4.41	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	875/1379	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1180/1236	3.57	3.75	4.08	4.16	2.80
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	593/1121	4.66	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	351/1122	4.84	4.52	4.36	4.34	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	383/1121	4.82	4.64	4.40	4.39	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	410/790	4.59	4.07	4.06	4.01	4.09

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Sawyers,Seth A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	500/1449	4.54	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	479/1446	4.44	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	4.82	4.41	4.34	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	157/1402	4.64	4.39	4.27	4.28	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	9	5	3.94	894/1358	4.15	4.15	4.13	4.13	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1327	4.60	4.39	4.16	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	798/1435	4.01	4.01	4.20	4.17	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	938/1446	4.79	4.59	4.67	4.63	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	493/1437	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.39
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	929/1386	4.57	4.44	4.48	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	372/1390	4.81	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	564/1379	4.41	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	310/1379	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.37	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1236	3.57	3.75	4.08	4.16	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	165/1121	4.66	4.39	4.18	4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	275/1122	4.84	4.52	4.36	4.34	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	439/1121	4.82	4.64	4.40	4.39	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	96/790	4.59	4.07	4.06	4.01	4.78

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Spring 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
Discussion														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	390/1449	4.16	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	918/1446	3.95	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	7	11	4.35	696/1256	3.98	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	716/1402	4.16	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	241/1358	4.29	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	309/1327	4.07	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	3	3	10	3.95	1015/1435	3.28	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	1135/1446	4.61	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	527/1437	4.08	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	903/1386	4.27	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	582/1390	4.70	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	893/1379	4.03	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	15	4.53	666/1379	3.98	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	980/1236	3.46	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	207/1121	4.38	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	471/1122	4.38	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	683/1121	4.19	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	555/790	3.46	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.78



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	20

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 02
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	821/1449	4.16	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	13	4.29	819/1446	3.95	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	738/1256	3.98	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	10	4.21	859/1402	4.16	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	5	14	4.38	511/1358	4.29	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	9	10	4.17	730/1327	4.07	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	7	5	5	3.17	1359/1435	3.28	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	473/1446	4.61	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	868/1437	4.08	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	630/1386	4.27	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	659/1390	4.70	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	702/1379	4.03	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	977/1379	3.98	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1086/1236	3.46	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.31
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	353/1121	4.38	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	479/1122	4.38	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	673/1121	4.19	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/790	3.46	4.07	4.06	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 301 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 27
Title: Analysis Literary Lang		Questionnaires: 24
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														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 03
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1357/1449	4.16	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	4	2	3.36	1369/1446	3.95	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	1207/1256	3.98	4.41	4.34	4.39	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	8	3.93	1079/1402	4.16	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	978/1358	4.29	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	3	3.43	1161/1327	4.07	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	6	1	1	2.71	1403/1435	3.28	4.01	4.20	4.25	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	970/1446	4.61	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1016/1437	4.08	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1282/1386	4.27	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	1238/1390	4.70	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	1300/1379	4.03	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1312/1379	3.98	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1236	3.46	3.75	4.08	4.18	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	832/1121	4.38	4.39	4.18	4.31	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	3	6	4.00	857/1122	4.38	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	965/1121	4.19	4.64	4.40	4.53	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	719/790	3.46	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 03
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2 Required for Majors	8 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 3 General	4	Under-grad 14 Non-major
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 to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01
Title:	Art Of The Essay
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	404/1449	4.64	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1022/1446	4.07	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	****	4.41	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	641/1402	4.43	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	0	7	3	3.57	1139/1358	3.57	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	328/1327	4.58	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	933/1435	4.07	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1190/1446	4.29	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	364/1437	4.50	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1058/1390	4.62	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	504/1379	4.62	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	655/1379	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1236	****	3.75	4.08	4.18	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	606/1121	4.25	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	537/1122	4.50	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	246/1121	4.88	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/790	****	4.07	4.06	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01
Title:	Art Of The Essay
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	15

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

### 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	1	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	580/1449	4.52	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	12	4.30	819/1446	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	8	11	4.00	936/1256	4.00	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	12	10	4.19	868/1402	4.19	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	267/1358	4.63	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	13	7	3.96	881/1327	3.96	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	14	10	4.23	788/1435	4.23	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	4.00	1354/1446	4.00	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	10	9	4.13	780/1437	4.13	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.13
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	480/1386	4.74	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	582/1390	4.89	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	11	13	4.37	796/1379	4.37	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	20	4.56	633/1379	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	3	2	4	4	3	3.13	1132/1236	3.13	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	7	8	4.05	713/1121	4.05	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	717/1122	4.30	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	748/1121	4.30	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	7	17	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/790	****	4.07	4.06	4.11	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	27

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 305 01
Title:	Brit Lit:Restor - Romant
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	3	21	4.52	580/1449	4.52	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	20	4.45	650/1446	4.45	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	510/1256	4.52	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	6	18	4.48	556/1402	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	23	4.71	191/1358	4.71	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	4	19	4.50	404/1327	4.50	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	5	18	4.39	622/1435	4.39	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	23	4	4.15	1289/1446	4.15	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	11	12	4.35	539/1437	4.35	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	2	21	4.65	630/1386	4.65	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	684/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	21	4.65	451/1379	4.65	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	655/1379	4.54	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	18	1	0	5	0	1	3.00	****/1236	****	3.75	4.08	4.18	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	365/1121	4.55	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	275/1122	4.80	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	439/1121	4.70	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	2	1	9	2	3	3.18	712/790	3.18	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.18

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 305 01
Title:	Brit Lit:Restor - Romant
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	29

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	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 306 01
Title:	Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod
Instructor:	Fritz,Morgan D

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	11	15	4.19	967/1449	4.19	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	19	4.47	624/1446	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	21	4.56	467/1256	4.56	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	293/1402	4.71	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	93/1358	4.88	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	18	4.44	488/1327	4.44	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	24	4.59	391/1435	4.59	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	368/1446	4.94	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	6	11	11	4.18	724/1437	4.18	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.18
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	22	4.68	599/1386	4.68	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	607/1390	4.87	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	23	4.67	437/1379	4.67	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	6	23	4.70	461/1379	4.70	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	0	6	6	9	3.75	910/1236	3.75	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	21	4.76	198/1121	4.76	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	351/1122	4.72	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	281/1121	4.84	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	4	0	2	3	5	3.36	677/790	3.36	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.36

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 306 01
Title:	Brit Lit: Victorian-Mod
Instructor:	Fritz,Morgan D

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	32

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	7
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	9	5	13	3.97	1138/1449	3.97	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	12	4.14	979/1446	4.14	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	1123/1256	3.67	4.41	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	10	11	4.14	917/1402	4.14	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	224/1358	4.68	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	3	18	4.36	572/1327	4.36	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	9	12	4.11	918/1435	4.11	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	421/1446	4.93	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	6	17	5	3.96	927/1437	3.96	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.96
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	583/1386	4.68	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	855/1390	4.77	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	635/1379	4.50	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	5	15	4.23	917/1379	4.23	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	8	4	10	3.88	840/1236	3.88	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.88
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	502/1121	4.39	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	691/1122	4.33	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	473/1121	4.67	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	10	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	770/790	2.75	4.07	4.06	4.11	2.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	35
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War		Questionnaires:	29
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
Discussion														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 01
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Maher, Jennifer

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	175/1449	4.62	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	397/1446	4.46	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	556/1256	4.60	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	304/1402	4.43	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	142/1358	4.63	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	533/1327	4.45	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	15	4.43	572/1435	4.44	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1005/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	470/1437	4.16	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	204/1386	4.72	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	266/1390	4.92	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	235/1379	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	225/1379	4.64	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	77/1236	4.67	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.91
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1121	4.78	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	313/1122	4.63	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1121	4.81	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	146/790	4.55	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.64



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 01
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Maher, Jennifer

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	4	12	4.39	758/1449	4.62	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	841/1446	4.46	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	302/1256	4.60	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	898/1402	4.43	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	13	4.47	404/1358	4.63	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	404/1327	4.45	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	3	13	4.44	558/1435	4.44	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	824/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1001/1437	4.16	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	783/1386	4.72	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	582/1390	4.92	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	675/1379	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	13	4.41	776/1379	4.64	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	415/1236	4.67	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.43
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	365/1121	4.78	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	537/1122	4.63	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	515/1121	4.81	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	217/790	4.55	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.47

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.63	4.25	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	24
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech		Questionnaires:	18
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
Self Paced														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8 Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General 4	Under-grad 18	Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives 1 P 0 I 0 Other 0 ? 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01
Title:	Structure Of English
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	847/1449	4.32	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	745/1446	4.36	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	302/1256	4.73	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	7	11	4.09	963/1402	4.09	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	5	5	7	3.65	1097/1358	3.65	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	2	8	6	3.57	1100/1327	3.57	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	949/1435	4.05	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	526/1446	4.90	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	10	3	3.82	1068/1437	3.82	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.82
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	716/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	20	4.81	787/1390	4.81	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	982/1379	4.15	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	13	4.41	786/1379	4.41	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	****/1236	****	3.75	4.08	4.18	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	727/1121	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	3	1	12	4.22	764/1122	4.22	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	704/1121	4.39	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.39
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	617/790	3.57	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.57

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01
Title:	Structure Of English
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	22

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

### 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	1	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 332 01
Title:	Contemp American Lit
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	929/1449	4.22	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	997/1446	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	619/1256	4.43	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	734/1402	4.33	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	88/1358	4.88	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	385/1327	4.53	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	8	4	2	3.18	1357/1435	3.18	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	566/1446	4.88	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	769/1437	4.13	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.13
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	1	9	4.13	1128/1386	4.13	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	372/1390	4.93	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	599/1379	4.53	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	836/1379	4.33	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	876/1236	3.82	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.82
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	300/1121	4.64	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	360/1122	4.71	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	544/1121	4.57	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	666/790	3.40	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 332 01
Title:	Contemp American Lit
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	18

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

### Frequency Distribution

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



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 346 01
Title:	Literary Themes
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	209/1449	4.82	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	325/1446	4.68	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	367/1256	4.67	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	504/1402	4.52	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	98/1358	4.86	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	281/1327	4.64	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	655/1435	4.36	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	18	3	1	3.23	1440/1446	3.23	4.59	4.67	4.68	3.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	296/1437	4.59	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	462/1386	4.75	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	504/1379	4.62	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	370/1379	4.76	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	3	1	4	4	3.75	910/1236	3.75	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	347/1121	4.59	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	254/1122	4.82	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	234/1121	4.88	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	581/790	3.69	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.69

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 346 01
Title:	Literary Themes
Instructor:	Orgelfinger, Gai

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors	7	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0 General	0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	2	
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 371 01
Title:	Creative Writing-Fiction
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1059/1449	4.08	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	2	7	4.00	1061/1446	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	810/1402	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	786/1358	4.08	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	591/1327	4.33	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	970/1435	4.00	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1127/1446	4.36	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	809/1437	4.09	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.09
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1101/1386	4.18	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	1125/1390	4.55	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	859/1379	4.30	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	0	7	3.91	1125/1379	3.91	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	709/1236	4.00	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1121	4.88	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	438/1122	4.63	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	246/1121	4.88	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	200/790	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 371 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 14
Title: Creative Writing-Fiction		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Shivnan,Sally A		

  

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

### 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 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other 0		
			? 1		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 373 01
Title:	Creative Writing-Poetry
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	218/1449	4.80	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	571/1446	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.41	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	236/1402	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1272/1358	3.20	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	774/1327	4.13	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1084/1435	3.88	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	949/1446	4.60	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	735/1386	4.57	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	743/1379	4.43	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	611/1379	4.57	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.75	4.08	4.18	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1121	4.80	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	275/1122	4.80	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	524/1121	4.60	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	731/790	3.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 373 01
Title:	Creative Writing-Poetry
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	11

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

### 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	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 379 01
Title:	Prins/Pract In Tech Comm
Instructor:	Maher,Jennifer

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1106/1449	4.00	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1133/1446	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1081/1256	3.75	4.41	4.34	4.39	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	810/1402	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	460/1358	4.43	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	512/1327	4.42	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	6	2	4	3.69	1192/1435	3.69	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1135/1446	4.36	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	809/1437	4.09	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.09
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	946/1386	4.38	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	684/1390	4.85	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1110/1379	3.92	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	836/1379	4.33	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	980/1236	3.60	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	466/1121	4.43	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	728/1122	4.29	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	544/1121	4.57	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	259/790	4.40	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.40

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 379 01
Title:	Prins/Pract In Tech Comm
Instructor:	Maher, Jennifer

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	14

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

### 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	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01
Title:	Intro To News Writing
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	6	7	3.94	1154/1449	3.94	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	944/1446	4.18	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	899/1256	4.09	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	771/1402	4.29	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	1002/1358	3.82	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	572/1327	4.35	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1084/1435	3.88	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	566/1446	4.88	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	4	8	2	3.73	1131/1437	3.73	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	6	9	4.29	1022/1386	4.29	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	1025/1390	4.65	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1038/1379	4.06	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	1004/1379	4.12	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	1052/1236	3.40	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.40
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1033/1121	3.17	4.39	4.18	4.31	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	2	1	1	5	3.25	1045/1122	3.25	4.52	4.36	4.46	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	0	8	4.17	809/1121	4.17	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	681/790	3.33	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01
Title:	Intro To News Writing
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01
Title:	Feature Writing
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	977/1449	4.18	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	690/1446	4.41	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.41	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	697/1402	4.38	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	2	1	10	3.94	905/1358	3.94	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	309/1327	4.60	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	1	4	6	3.80	1143/1435	3.80	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	963/1446	4.59	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	244/1437	4.64	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.64
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	774/1386	4.53	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	787/1390	4.80	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	599/1379	4.53	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	579/1379	4.60	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	4	0	0	1	1	2.17	1225/1236	2.17	3.75	4.08	4.18	2.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	198/1121	4.77	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	233/1122	4.85	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	772/790	2.71	4.07	4.06	4.11	2.71

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01
Title:	Feature Writing
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.48	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 382 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 24
Title: Feature Writing		Questionnaires: 17
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
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	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	8	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 385 01
Title:	New Media, Digital Lit
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	953/1446	4.17	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1163/1256	3.50	4.41	4.34	4.39	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	549/1358	4.33	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	562/1327	4.36	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	598/1435	4.42	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	918/1446	4.64	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	550/1437	4.33	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	878/1386	4.44	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	958/1390	4.70	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	859/1379	4.30	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	926/1379	4.22	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	709/1236	4.00	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	222/1122	4.86	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/790	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 385 01
Title:	New Media, Digital Lit
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	299/1449	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	130/1446	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	182/1256	4.69	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	54/1402	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	13	4.23	658/1358	4.05	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	112/1327	4.54	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	155/1435	4.38	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1127/1446	4.54	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	140/1437	4.05	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1386	4.42	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1390	4.73	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1379	4.44	4.36	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	295/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	77/1236	4.02	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.90
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1121	4.31	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1122	4.49	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1121	4.74	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/790	4.24	4.07	4.06	4.11	5.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Terhorst II, Ray

Term - Spring 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
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.63	4.25	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Terhorst II, Ray

Term - Spring 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	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	446/1449	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	186/1446	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	206/1256	4.69	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	179/1402	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	549/1358	4.05	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	91/1327	4.54	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	411/1435	4.38	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	627/1446	4.54	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	184/1437	4.05	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.71
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	102/1386	4.42	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	266/1390	4.73	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	139/1379	4.44	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	476/1236	4.02	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.35
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	681/1121	4.31	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	776/1122	4.49	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	405/1121	4.74	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	389/790	4.24	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.48	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires:	21
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean				

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1053/1449	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	466/1446	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	887/1256	4.69	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	480/1402	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	927/1358	4.05	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	328/1327	4.54	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	687/1435	4.38	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1446	4.54	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	868/1437	4.05	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1177/1386	4.42	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1162/1390	4.73	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	859/1379	4.44	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1053/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1205/1236	4.02	3.75	4.08	4.18	2.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	700/1121	4.31	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	691/1122	4.49	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1121	4.74	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	545/790	4.24	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	13

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

### 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	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
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 to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1277/1449	4.29	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	6	3.73	1247/1446	4.49	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	4.69	4.41	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1194/1402	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1060/1358	4.05	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	1	6	3.82	986/1327	4.54	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1143/1435	4.38	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1320/1446	4.54	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	3	0	4	3	0	2.70	1408/1437	4.05	4.06	4.12	4.14	2.70
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1282/1386	4.42	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	1192/1390	4.73	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	1	2	5	3.55	1251/1379	4.44	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1231/1379	4.35	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	492/1236	4.02	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	727/1121	4.31	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	612/1122	4.49	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	544/1121	4.74	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	425/790	4.24	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	11

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	479/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	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	3	Non-major	3

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Spring 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														

84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	2									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 02
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1106/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1061/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	4.30	4.41	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1296/1358	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1406/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1151/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1172/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1177/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1340/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1334/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	731/790	4.58	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.00

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 02	Term - Spring 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
Discussion														

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	354/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	970/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	868/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	731/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/790	4.58	4.07	4.06	4.11	5.00
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/31	5.00	4.75	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/24	5.00	4.50	4.34	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/15	5.00	4.50	4.18	5.00	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 4
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
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	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/13	5.00	4.63	4.07	5.00	5.00	

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 04
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	1
Questionnaires:	1

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1061/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1428/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1364/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1144/1236	2.75	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	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	0						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 04
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	1
Questionnaires:	1

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	1	Non-major				1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0										
				I	0	Other		0							
				?	0										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1304/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1273/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	734/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	591/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1421/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	888/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1311/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1177/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1053/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1227/1236	2.75	3.75	4.08	4.18	2.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	200/790	4.58	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 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														

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 06
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1106/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1432/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1236/1256	4.30	4.41	4.34	4.39	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1274/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	253/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1406/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1419/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	2.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1362/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1250/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1058/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1334/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1234/1236	2.75	3.75	4.08	4.18	1.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	547/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	731/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/790	4.58	4.07	4.06	4.11	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 06	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	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	2	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1304/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	354/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	371/1358	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	479/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1245/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	727/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	3	Non-major			3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 08
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	821/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1061/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1256	4.30	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	827/1358	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	313/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	868/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	2.75	3.75	4.08	4.18	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	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 08	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car		

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							
				P	0										
				I	0	Other	0								
				?	1										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 09
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	354/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	888/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/790	4.58	4.07	4.06	4.11	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	1

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 09	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
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
Discussion														
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	3	Non-major			2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	1									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 10
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	594/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	936/1256	4.30	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1331/1358	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.14	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	769/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	788/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	803/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/67	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/66	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.70	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 10
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1/64	5.00	4.87	4.25	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/75	5.00	4.92	4.32	4.80	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/73	5.00	4.68	4.00	4.64	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	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 11
Title:	Tutorial In Writing
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1449	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	4.21	4.26	4.29	4.33	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	4.30	4.41	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.66	4.39	4.27	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.18	4.15	4.13	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	479/1435	3.73	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	4.86	4.59	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1437	3.91	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.59	4.44	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1340/1379	4.36	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.45	4.34	4.36	4.40	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	4.83	4.39	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	4.87	4.64	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/790	4.58	4.07	4.06	4.11	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 11	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
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	
Discussion															

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	6	3	2	5	3.38	1382/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	1	5	3.38	1365/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1227/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	1	5	3	3.00	1296/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1052/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	4	3	3	3.00	1377/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1261/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	5	6	0	3.00	1364/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1328/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1322/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1284/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	6	2	3.06	1332/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1200/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	2.63
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1047/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	979/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	978/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	691/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.29



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Hickernell, Mary

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	16

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

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Porter,Jane

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	796/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	637/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	444/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	5	4	7	3.50	1174/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	180/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	1015/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	788/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	868/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	630/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	531/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	451/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	943/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	538/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.28
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	693/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	827/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	311/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Porter,Jane

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	26
Title:	Technical Writing		Questionnaires:	20
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
Self Paced														
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10									
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		5	Under-grad	20	Non-major		20	
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	1									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 03
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Sly-Thompson,AI

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	2	3	4	4	2.80	1427/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	2.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	4	3	8	3.50	1327/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	3	2	4	3.23	1217/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	2	3	3	7	3.37	1313/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	6	1	3	6	3.05	1294/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	2	5	6	3.37	1185/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	4	6	3.45	1278/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	263/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	3	6	3	1	2.75	1403/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	2.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	6	2	4	6	3.30	1346/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	1242/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	3	5	7	3.63	1229/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	1	4	7	3.26	1313/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	4	1	0	3	3	3.00	1144/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	649/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	787/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	642/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	425/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 03
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Sly-Thompson,AI

Term - Spring 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
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.48	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 11	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 7	Graduate	0
				Major	0

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 03		Term - Spring 2011					Enrollment: 25								
Title: Technical Writing							Questionnaires: 20								
Instructor: Sly-Thompson,AI															
Questions		NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Self Paced				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General			4	Under-grad	20	Non-major		20	
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0										
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0										
				I	0	Other			0						
				?	0										

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Spring 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
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	0	8	4	0	2.87	1424/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	2.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	8	3	2	3.27	1386/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1081/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1079/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	1	6	1	2	2.85	1323/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	2.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	3	4	3.79	1002/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1364/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	1019/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	7	5	0	3.31	1322/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	735/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1321/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1030/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1197/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	2	0	2	6	3.91	823/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.91
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1006/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1067/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	978/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	545/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.80



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Technical Writing			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														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27    0	0.00-0.99    0	A        12	Required for Majors        7	Graduate        0	Major        1
28-55    0	1.00-1.99    0	B        1			
56-83    0	2.00-2.99    1	C        0	General        5	Under-grad        16	Non-major        15
84-150    7	3.00-3.49    4	D        0			
Grad.    0	3.50-4.00    3	F        0	Electives        2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P        0			
		I        0	Other        0		
		?        2			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 05
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	6	3	3.47	1363/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	6	5	3.68	1265/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	936/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	11	1	3.67	1210/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	4	8	3.68	1081/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	968/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1225/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	918/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	9	3	1	3.13	1356/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.13
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	7	6	4	3.82	1251/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1143/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1138/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1225/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	8	2	3	3.25	1104/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	662/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	287/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.33

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 05	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Writing		Questionnaires: 19
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.44	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	5	8	3.76	1257/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	1	12	4.14	970/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	2	1	0	7	4.20	819/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	781/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	727/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	679/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	3	1	10	3.57	1248/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	627/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	791/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.11
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	1117/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	855/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	5	0	9	4.29	876/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	917/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	591/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.20
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	700/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	717/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	694/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	688/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.30

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/200	****	4.55	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/201	****	4.47	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/202	****	4.69	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/196	****	4.63	4.25	4.37	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	4.75	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/18	****	4.75	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	4.50	4.34	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

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	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/15	****	4.50	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	4.63	4.07	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer,Barbara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	0	8	3	2	3.06	1414/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	3	4	3	3.13	1405/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1246/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	2.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1299/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1288/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	6	1	3.33	1196/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	4	5	3	0	2.64	1407/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	2.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	1354/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	4	6	3	0	2.92	1382/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	2.92
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1341/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1276/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	9	1	2	3.07	1336/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	7	3	0	2.60	1366/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1222/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	2.25
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	5	1	0	2.75	1079/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1005/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	959/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	763/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	2.86

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Kreamer, Barbara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2 Required for Majors	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 3 General	Under-grad 17	Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other		
			? 5		



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Harris,Linda R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	5	1	3	2.87	1424/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	2.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	1	5	3.40	1359/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	936/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1116/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	0	4	2	2	2.83	1324/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	1144/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	0	3	3	4	3.21	1348/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	970/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	3	4	0	3.10	1359/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	3.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1269/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1358/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	3.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1152/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1269/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1059/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 08	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Technical Writing		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Harris,Linda R		

  

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Porter,Jane

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	6	7	4	3.52	1351/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1151/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	716/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	7	3	3	2.80	1326/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	654/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	2	9	5	3.48	1271/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	752/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	868/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	1117/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	1180/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	893/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	1147/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	6	7	4	3.78	898/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	3.78
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	980/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	746/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	710/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	590/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	25
Title:	Technical Writing		Questionnaires:	21
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
Discussion														

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	796/1449	3.44	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	830/1446	3.71	4.26	4.29	4.33	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	367/1256	3.82	4.41	4.34	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	584/1402	3.96	4.39	4.27	4.37	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	986/1358	3.28	4.15	4.13	4.14	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	500/1327	3.92	4.39	4.16	4.23	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	808/1435	3.43	4.01	4.20	4.25	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	421/1446	4.62	4.59	4.67	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	638/1437	3.46	4.06	4.12	4.14	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	534/1386	3.99	4.44	4.48	4.53	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	821/1390	4.40	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	814/1379	3.95	4.36	4.34	4.38	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	875/1379	3.63	4.34	4.36	4.40	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	641/1236	3.48	3.75	4.08	4.18	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	335/1121	3.74	4.39	4.18	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	275/1122	4.03	4.52	4.36	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	439/1121	4.27	4.64	4.40	4.53	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	102/790	3.81	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.44	4.29	4.44	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.64	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.25	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	5.00	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.75	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10
Title:	Technical Writing
Instructor:	Walters, April I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	14

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

?      1

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01
Title:	Method Of Interpretation
Instructor:	Berman, Jessica

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	404/1449	4.65	4.19	4.33	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	610/1446	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	324/1256	4.71	4.41	4.34	4.43	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	570/1402	4.47	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	198/1358	4.71	4.15	4.13	4.21	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	328/1327	4.59	4.39	4.16	4.28	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	518/1435	4.47	4.01	4.20	4.27	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	687/1446	4.82	4.59	4.67	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	279/1437	4.60	4.06	4.12	4.20	4.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	254/1386	4.88	4.44	4.48	4.55	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	372/1390	4.94	4.77	4.74	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	564/1379	4.56	4.36	4.34	4.40	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	385/1379	4.75	4.34	4.36	4.44	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	926/1236	3.73	3.75	4.08	4.13	3.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	300/1121	4.64	4.39	4.18	4.39	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	360/1122	4.71	4.52	4.36	4.54	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	350/1121	4.79	4.64	4.40	4.60	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	170/790	4.57	4.07	4.06	4.27	4.57



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01
Title:	Method Of Interpretation
Instructor:	Berman, Jessica

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

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

### 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	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01
Title:	Language In Society
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	238/1449	4.79	4.19	4.33	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	75/1446	4.92	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.41	4.34	4.43	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	224/1402	4.77	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	108/1358	4.85	4.15	4.13	4.21	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	173/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.28	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	205/1435	4.77	4.01	4.20	4.27	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	858/1446	4.69	4.59	4.67	4.71	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1437	5.00	4.06	4.12	4.20	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.44	4.48	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.36	4.34	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.34	4.36	4.44	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	492/1236	4.33	3.75	4.08	4.13	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.39	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	264/1122	4.82	4.52	4.36	4.54	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.64	4.40	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	118/790	4.70	4.07	4.06	4.27	4.70

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01
Title:	Language In Society
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	15

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 410 01
Title:	Seminar In Genre Studies
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	500/1449	4.57	4.19	4.33	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	382/1446	4.64	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.41	4.34	4.43	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	281/1402	4.71	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	250/1358	4.64	4.15	4.13	4.21	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	337/1327	4.57	4.39	4.16	4.28	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	336/1435	4.64	4.01	4.20	4.27	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.59	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	417/1437	4.45	4.06	4.12	4.20	4.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	183/1386	4.92	4.44	4.48	4.55	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	478/1390	4.92	4.77	4.74	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	114/1379	4.92	4.36	4.34	4.40	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	267/1379	4.83	4.34	4.36	4.44	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	331/1236	4.50	3.75	4.08	4.13	4.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	114/1121	4.91	4.39	4.18	4.39	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	170/1122	4.91	4.52	4.36	4.54	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1121	4.91	4.64	4.40	4.60	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	404/790	4.11	4.07	4.06	4.27	4.11

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 410 01
Title:	Seminar In Genre Studies
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	14

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/67	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.47	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/66	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.33	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/64	4.86	4.87	4.25	4.24	4.86
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/75	5.00	4.92	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	19/73	4.71	4.68	4.00	4.09	4.71

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 4		
				Other	1

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 486 01
Title:	Seminar In Teaching Comp
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	334/1449	4.69	4.19	4.33	4.46	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	531/1446	4.54	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.41	4.34	4.43	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	150/1402	4.85	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	62/1358	4.92	4.15	4.13	4.21	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	173/1327	4.77	4.39	4.16	4.28	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	449/1435	4.54	4.01	4.20	4.27	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.59	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	270/1437	4.62	4.06	4.12	4.20	4.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	735/1386	4.57	4.44	4.48	4.55	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1379	4.86	4.36	4.34	4.40	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.34	4.36	4.44	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	****	3.75	4.08	4.13	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	114/1121	4.91	4.39	4.18	4.39	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1121	4.91	4.64	4.40	4.60	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	425/790	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.27	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 486 01
Title:	Seminar In Teaching Comp
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	13

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.09	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 493 01
Title:	Seminar In CT
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1449	5.00	4.19	4.33	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	354/1446	4.67	4.26	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.41	4.34	4.43	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	113/1358	4.83	4.15	4.13	4.21	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1327	4.83	4.39	4.16	4.28	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	313/1435	4.67	4.01	4.20	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1446	4.83	4.59	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	470/1437	4.40	4.06	4.12	4.20	4.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.44	4.48	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1379	4.75	4.36	4.34	4.40	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.34	4.36	4.44	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.75	4.08	4.13	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1121	4.80	4.39	4.18	4.39	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.52	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1121	4.80	4.64	4.40	4.60	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/790	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.27	5.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 493 01
Title:	Seminar In CT
Instructor:	Shipka,Jody L.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	6

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.87	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.92	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	4.68	4.00	4.09	****

### 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	1	Major	4
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	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						