Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02		Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition						Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	676/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	541/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	694/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	590/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	268/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	517/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	222/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	2	12	1	3.75	1517/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	521/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1148/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	727/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1030/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	****

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	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	632/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	297/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	476/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	137/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	234/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	4	10	4.38	696/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	9	4	1	3.33	1533/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	3.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	244/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	659/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	438/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	692/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	3	0	1	3	3.25	1168/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	203/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	280/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	267/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 03	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	173/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	21
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	632/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	252/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	181/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	178/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	934/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1268/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	310/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	188/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	244/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	270/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1307/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	1.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	21
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	377/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.22

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	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Composition								Questionnaires: 20				
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	1060/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	992/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	790/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	220/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	480/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	944/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	10	4	4.00	1455/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	261/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	817/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	592/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	617/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	498/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1162/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	661/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	607/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	622/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.84	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 05		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	20
Instructor:	Dunnigan,Brian					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 08	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1460/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	4	4	4	3.40	1430/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	1281/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	1112/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	4	7	3.80	1053/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	2	3	4	3.29	1388/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	482/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	2	0	5	7	0	3.21	1386/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	1113/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	969/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	0	5	5	3.64	1291/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	2	6	3.57	1297/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	1184/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	1	6	3.62	985/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1059/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	0	1	9	4.08	899/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	3	0	3	0	6	3.50	713/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Composition								Questionnaires: 15			
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I											

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 08		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	2	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	11	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment:	15
Title:	**Composition**									**Questionnaires:**	**10**
Instructor:	**Bloom,Ryan I**										

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1315/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	867/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	906/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	578/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	740/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1238/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	920/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	690/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	538/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	907/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1002/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1218/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	634/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	222/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	402/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 09		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	15
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I					

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	361/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 10	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 9
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Bloom,Ryan I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1365/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1243/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	822/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1126/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	792/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	955/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	771/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1213/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	728/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	673/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	755/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1108/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1200/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	966/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	499/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 10		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	9
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	7
Instructor:	Bloom,Ryan I					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	478/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 11		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1173/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	810/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	428/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	6	2	4	3.57	1203/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	355/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	630/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	705/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	421/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	690/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	1197/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	907/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	855/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	698/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	634/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	796/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 11							Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition										Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane										

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	291/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	18	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100 12	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Putzel,Diane		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	6	5	5	3.32	1467/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	14	4.27	904/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	671/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	1	16	4.52	524/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	5	0	2	4	5	3.25	1315/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	216/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1026/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	11	6	4.11	842/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	858/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1039/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	1	13	4.39	809/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	6	8	4.00	1108/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	2	5	0	9	4.00	761/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	951/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	507/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	790/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.30

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 12	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition			Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Putzel,Diane				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	181/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	**Composition**		**Questionnaires: 17**
Instructor:	**Pekarske,Nicole**		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	765/1542	4.03	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	656/1542	4.32	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	275/1498	4.41	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	815/1428	4.15	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	455/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	560/1521	4.15	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1442/1541	4.42	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	873/1518	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	690/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1039/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1038/1471	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1044/1470	4.24	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1254/1310	3.13	3.88	4.06	3.93	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	667/1210	4.23	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	918/1211	4.48	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	722/1207	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100 13		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole				

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	273/859	4.19	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 27			
Title:	Composition									Questionnaires: 22			
Instructor:	MacDougall,Elai												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	9	5	3.77	1331/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	799/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	373/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	524/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	670/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	530/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	7	12	4.32	772/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	18	2	4.00	1455/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	920/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	858/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	1142/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	587/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	11	9	4.29	934/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	495/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	9	5	3.89	858/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	5	8	5	4.00	918/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	527/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	1	1	5	4	3.62	672/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 01		Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment: 27
Title:	Composition						Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	MacDougall,Elai						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title: Composition		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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	7	6	3.84	1295/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	855/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	801/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	733/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	1030/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	505/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	944/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	721/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	629/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	598/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	592/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	525/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	886/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	698/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	681/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	651/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	630/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	382/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 26
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Walters,April I					

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 04		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	26
Title:	Composition				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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 21
Title:	**Composition**								**Questionnaires: 16**
Instructor:	**Killgallon,Dona**								

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	818/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	220/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	125/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	252/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	284/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	234/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	124/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	1286/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	219/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	568/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	268/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	217/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	546/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	266/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	290/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	769/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	576/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 07	Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment: 21
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Killgallon,Dona					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	3.92	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 10			Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 25	
Title: Composition						Questionnaires: 18	
Instructor: Sneeringer,Holl							

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	869/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	553/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	638/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	674/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	452/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	355/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	8	4.06	1021/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	4.11	1422/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	421/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	598/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	727/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	525/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	498/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	852/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	266/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	558/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	164/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.93

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 10	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion															
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	188/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	410/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	391/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	215/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	252/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	181/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	178/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	913/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	1327/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	629/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	351/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	619/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	346/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	558/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1050/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	412/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	424/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	367/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.79

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 13		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Sneeringer,Holl						

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	267/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 19	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Composition		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Young,Michael A		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	844/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	590/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	298/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	569/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	288/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1111/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	738/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	640/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	1003/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	754/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	914/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	976/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1064/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	628/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	739/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	556/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	568/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 19		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	25
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	17
Instructor:	Young,Michael A					

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	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.84	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 19	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Composition		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Young,Michael A		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	486/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	541/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	373/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	512/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	336/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	234/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	696/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1234/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	295/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	272/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	198/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	374/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	224/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	390/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	528/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	578/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	334/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition							Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R							

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.82	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 22		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Pats,Victoria R					

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment:	15
Title:	Composition											Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	1124/1542	4.26	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	578/1542	4.55	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	896/1339	4.64	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	854/1498	4.54	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	851/1428	4.34	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	297/1407	4.59	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	1046/1521	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1525/1541	4.30	4.59	4.70	4.66	3.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	920/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1065/1472	4.60	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1142/1475	4.81	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	922/1471	4.60	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1044/1470	4.49	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1310	4.05	3.88	4.06	3.93	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	282/1210	4.45	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	661/1211	4.47	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	289/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	315/859	4.15	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 15
Title:	Composition					Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	3.92	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.22	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 100A 28		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	15
Title:	Composition				Questionnaires:	13
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
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 110 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 20
Title: Composition ESL Students		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Ware,Olga G		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1343/1542	4.13	4.21	4.33	4.18	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	2	3.75	1300/1542	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	1105/1339	4.07	4.51	4.32	4.14	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1272/1498	3.94	4.38	4.26	4.08	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	4	2	4	3.54	1219/1428	4.07	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	4	1	4	3.42	1251/1407	3.96	4.38	4.15	3.92	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	1	1	6	2	3.07	1424/1521	3.66	4.05	4.20	4.09	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	1401/1541	4.47	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	9	3	0	3.25	1375/1518	3.67	4.15	4.11	4.00	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	1	6	3	3.69	1362/1472	4.18	4.38	4.46	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1341/1475	4.50	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	4	1	3.15	1397/1471	3.97	4.35	4.32	4.23	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1318/1470	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.21	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1020/1310	4.01	3.88	4.06	3.93	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	866/1210	4.17	4.34	4.18	3.91	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1001/1211	4.11	4.51	4.37	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1038/1207	4.08	4.57	4.41	4.12	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Composition ESL Students			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Ware,Olga G			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	622/859	4.03	4.13	4.08	3.95	3.71

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 04		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 22
Title:	Composition ESL Students									Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Wowk,Tymofey E									

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	632/1542	4.13	4.21	4.33	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	429/1542	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.23	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	757/1339	4.07	4.51	4.32	4.14	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	11	4.20	906/1498	3.94	4.38	4.26	4.08	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	301/1428	4.07	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	405/1407	3.96	4.38	4.15	3.92	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	14	4.25	838/1521	3.66	4.05	4.20	4.09	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	853/1541	4.47	4.59	4.70	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	849/1518	3.67	4.15	4.11	4.00	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	598/1472	4.18	4.38	4.46	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	861/1475	4.50	4.78	4.72	4.63	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	319/1471	3.97	4.35	4.32	4.23	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	468/1470	4.09	4.32	4.33	4.21	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	414/1310	4.01	3.88	4.06	3.93	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	1	12	4.47	457/1210	4.17	4.34	4.18	3.91	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	723/1211	4.11	4.51	4.37	4.15	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	1	12	4.41	712/1207	4.08	4.57	4.41	4.12	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	3	1	12	4.35	303/859	4.03	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 110 04		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 22
Title: Composition ESL Students				Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Wowk,Tymofey E				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	38/207	4.60	4.63	4.12	3.92	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/210	4.80	4.65	4.17	4.14	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	81/202	4.67	4.67	4.50	4.49	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	79/202	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.22	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	78/199	4.40	4.40	4.15	4.14	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	42/69	4.60	4.80	4.56	4.27	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/25	****	****	4.59	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	4.84	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.84	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.82	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 110 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 22
Title:	Composition ESL Students			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Wowk,Tymofey E			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.77	****

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	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 51				
Title:	Introduction To Lit									Questionnaires: 38				
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika													

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	13	19	4.35	844/1542	4.35	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	29	4.73	338/1542	4.73	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	11	26	4.63	445/1339	4.63	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	11	21	4.53	524/1498	4.53	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	112/1428	4.86	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	10	19	4.19	757/1407	4.19	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	7	7	23	4.43	616/1521	4.43	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	24	6	3.97	1469/1541	3.97	4.59	4.70	4.68	3.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	357/1518	4.53	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	125/1472	4.94	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	162/1475	4.97	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	146/1471	4.92	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	33	4.89	203/1470	4.89	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	4	28	4.71	171/1310	4.71	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	****/1210	****	4.34	4.18	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	****/1211	****	4.51	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	****/1207	****	4.57	4.41	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/859	****	4.13	4.08	4.07	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 210 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	51
Title:	Introduction To Lit					Questionnaires:	38
Instructor:	Rockett,Danika						

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	13	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 41
Title:	English Grammar Usage			Questionnaires: 29
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	9	15	4.34	856/1542	4.34	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	178/1542	4.86	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	195/1339	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	180/1498	4.82	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	11	12	4.17	714/1428	4.17	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	6	15	4.44	480/1407	4.44	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	133/1521	4.86	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	9	4.31	1286/1541	4.31	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	286/1518	4.61	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	84/1472	4.96	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	130/1471	4.93	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	141/1470	4.93	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	1	8	13	4.39	435/1310	4.39	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	390/1210	4.57	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	155/1211	4.93	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	289/1207	4.86	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	177/859	4.62	4.13	4.08	4.07	4.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 41			
Title:	English Grammar Usage									Questionnaires: 29			
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 226 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	41
Title:	English Grammar Usage					Questionnaires:	29
Instructor:	Sorokin,Anissa						

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	29	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 241 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 34
Title: Currents In British Lit				Questionnaires: 27
Instructor: Clark-Hillard,M				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	818/1542	4.48	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	14	4.33	833/1542	4.61	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	649/1339	4.72	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	756/1498	4.49	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	22	4.70	220/1428	4.83	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	684/1407	4.29	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	7	14	4.26	838/1521	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	1038/1541	4.50	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	675/1518	4.27	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	418/1472	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	592/1475	4.93	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	6	20	4.63	513/1471	4.74	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	22	4.70	438/1470	4.72	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	3	7	9	4.10	711/1310	3.93	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	364/1210	4.69	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	451/1211	4.60	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	685/1207	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	440/859	3.92	4.13	4.08	4.07	4.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 34
Title:	Currents In British Lit		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Clark-Hillard,M		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.72	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 02		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 35					
Title:	Currents In British Lit							Questionnaires: 27					
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	524/1542	4.48	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	161/1542	4.61	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1339	4.72	4.51	4.32	4.40	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	404/1498	4.49	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	37/1428	4.83	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	16	4.33	599/1407	4.29	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	22	4.70	278/1521	4.48	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	10	4.38	1225/1541	4.50	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	14	7	4.27	663/1518	4.27	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	167/1472	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	215/1475	4.93	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	233/1471	4.74	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	22	4.73	399/1470	4.72	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	943/1310	3.93	3.88	4.06	4.19	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	243/1210	4.69	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	0	2	13	4.53	565/1211	4.60	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	461/1207	4.58	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 241 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 35
Title:	Currents In British Lit		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	2	1	1	9	4	3.71	626/859	3.92	4.13	4.08	4.07	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	27	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 46				
Title:	Currents In American Lit								Questionnaires: 26				
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	7	8	6	3.46	1443/1542	3.46	4.21	4.33	4.35	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	10	4.00	1122/1542	4.00	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	16	4.31	785/1339	4.31	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	6	13	4.21	906/1498	4.21	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	173/1428	4.76	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	12	4.20	740/1407	4.20	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	4	12	3.96	1083/1521	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.22	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	551/1541	4.92	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	920/1518	4.00	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	5	17	4.42	926/1472	4.42	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	592/1475	4.88	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	14	4.31	907/1471	4.31	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	513/1470	4.65	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	22	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1310	****	3.88	4.06	4.19	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	457/1210	4.48	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	889/1211	4.10	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	390/1207	4.76	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.76

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 243 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	46
Title:	Currents In American Lit			Questionnaires:	26
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	4	1	4	2	1	2.58	839/859	2.58	4.13	4.08	4.07	2.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	11	Under-grad	26	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01	Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 28				
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare										Questionnaires: 22				
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai														

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	940/1542	4.27	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	7	8	3.91	1208/1542	3.91	4.29	4.29	4.29	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	10	3.91	1054/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.40	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	926/1498	4.18	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	354/1428	4.55	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	1	6	10	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	7	9	3.91	1139/1521	3.91	4.05	4.20	4.22	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	19	2	4.05	1444/1541	4.05	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	6	6	4.00	920/1518	4.00	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	598/1472	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	269/1475	4.95	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	681/1471	4.48	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	834/1470	4.38	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	706/1310	4.11	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	628/1210	4.27	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	790/1211	4.27	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	722/1207	4.40	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 250 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 28
Title:	Intro To Shakespeare			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	713/859	3.50	4.13	4.08	4.07	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction		Questionnaires: 18
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	805/1542	4.39	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	776/1542	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	361/1339	4.71	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	416/1498	4.61	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	5	3.83	1038/1428	3.83	4.20	4.12	4.17	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	480/1407	4.44	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	870/1521	4.22	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.59	4.70	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	521/1518	4.38	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	1022/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	808/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	696/1471	4.47	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	1051/1470	4.13	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1310	****	3.88	4.06	4.19	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1210	4.88	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.40	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 271 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Creat Wrtg-Fiction				Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Shivnan,Sally A				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.07	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01			Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 27		
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry										**Questionnaires: 13**		
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	4	2	0	1	2.00	1541/1542	2.00	4.21	4.33	4.35	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	3	2	1	0	1.77	1540/1542	1.77	4.29	4.29	4.29	1.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	2	2	1	0	2.13	1495/1498	2.13	4.38	4.26	4.31	2.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	3	1	1	2.45	1413/1428	2.45	4.20	4.12	4.17	2.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	6	0	2	1	2.33	1398/1407	2.33	4.38	4.15	4.14	2.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	9	2	0	0	0	1.18	1519/1521	1.18	4.05	4.20	4.22	1.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1225/1541	4.38	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	4	2	3	0	0	1.89	1516/1518	1.89	4.15	4.11	4.12	1.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	8	3	1	0	1	1.69	1472/1472	1.69	4.38	4.46	4.53	1.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1445/1475	3.54	4.78	4.72	4.79	3.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	2	3	0	1	1.92	1468/1471	1.92	4.35	4.32	4.37	1.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	1	1	0	1	1.58	1470/1470	1.58	4.32	4.33	4.40	1.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1208/1210	1.50	4.34	4.18	4.18	1.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1202/1211	2.50	4.51	4.37	4.34	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1172/1207	3.00	4.57	4.41	4.40	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 273 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	27
Title:	Int Creative Wtg-Poetry					Questionnaires:	13
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/859	****	4.13	4.08	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 22
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	85/1542	4.75	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	256/1542	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	186/1339	4.65	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1498	4.69	4.38	4.26	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	260/1428	4.46	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1407	4.83	4.38	4.15	4.14	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	343/1521	4.32	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1295/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1518	4.66	4.15	4.11	4.12	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	125/1472	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	323/1475	4.94	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	174/1471	4.78	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	106/1470	4.72	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	404/1310	4.24	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1210	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	377/1211	4.79	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1207	4.88	4.57	4.41	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/859	4.77	4.13	4.08	4.07	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 22		
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays										Questionnaires: 20		
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.68	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 22
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Wilkinson,Rache			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	169/1542	4.75	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	492/1542	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	550/1339	4.65	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	194/1498	4.69	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	181/1428	4.46	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	178/1407	4.83	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	441/1521	4.32	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	927/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	269/1518	4.66	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	209/1472	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1475	4.94	4.78	4.72	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	346/1471	4.78	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	311/1470	4.72	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	526/1310	4.24	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	90/1210	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1211	4.79	4.51	4.37	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1207	4.88	4.57	4.41	4.40	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	86/859	4.77	4.13	4.08	4.07	4.87

Run Date: 6/29/2012 9:34:22 AM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Flanigan,Sean		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	3.72	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Carillo,John P			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	805/1542	4.75	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1100/1542	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	507/1339	4.65	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	745/1498	4.69	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	608/1428	4.46	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	355/1407	4.83	4.38	4.15	4.14	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	3	2	2	6	3.85	1176/1521	4.32	4.05	4.20	4.22	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	413/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	615/1518	4.66	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	659/1472	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	781/1475	4.94	4.78	4.72	4.79	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	538/1471	4.78	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	740/1470	4.72	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1310	4.24	3.88	4.06	4.19	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	412/1210	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	507/1211	4.79	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	499/1207	4.88	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 03	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Carillo,John P			

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	297/859	4.77	4.13	4.08	4.07	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 04		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 25				
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays									Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	297/1542	4.75	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	441/1542	4.52	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	476/1339	4.65	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	0	13	4.63	404/1498	4.69	4.38	4.26	4.31	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	1	11	4.18	714/1428	4.46	4.20	4.12	4.17	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	4.83	4.38	4.15	4.14	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	892/1521	4.32	4.05	4.20	4.22	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	413/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	211/1518	4.66	4.15	4.11	4.12	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	659/1472	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.53	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1475	4.94	4.78	4.72	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	209/1471	4.78	4.35	4.32	4.37	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	498/1470	4.72	4.32	4.33	4.40	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	761/1310	4.24	3.88	4.06	4.19	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1210	4.79	4.34	4.18	4.18	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	251/1211	4.79	4.51	4.37	4.34	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	300/1207	4.88	4.57	4.41	4.40	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	91/859	4.77	4.13	4.08	4.07	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 291 04		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 25				
Title:	Intro Wrtg Creat Essays								Questionnaires: 18				
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill												

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	4.55	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.70	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 291 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Intro Wrtg Creat Essays		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: McCarthy,Lucill		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 01		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 27				
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis								Questionnaires: 16				
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	780/1542	4.35	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	492/1542	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	195/1339	4.85	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	357/1498	4.43	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	181/1428	4.55	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	345/1407	4.31	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	452/1521	4.28	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	1124/1541	4.31	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	421/1518	4.19	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	401/1472	4.48	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	969/1475	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	306/1471	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	425/1470	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	606/1310	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1210	4.51	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1211	4.53	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1207	4.80	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	27
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis				Questionnaires:	16
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J					

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	120/859	4.33	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 300 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Comm/Tech - Analysis		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer		

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	918/1542	4.35	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	9	4.29	879/1542	4.45	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1339	4.85	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	1	10	4.19	926/1498	4.43	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	13	4.35	536/1428	4.55	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	851/1407	4.31	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1046/1521	4.28	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1422/1541	4.31	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	1057/1518	4.19	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1141/1472	4.48	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	1134/1475	4.65	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	9	6	4.06	1083/1471	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	10	4.29	926/1470	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	2	0	3	5	3.58	1028/1310	3.90	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	726/1210	4.51	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	898/1211	4.53	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	556/1207	4.80	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 300 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Comm/Tech - Analysis			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Maher,Jennifer			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	547/859	4.33	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 301 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title: Analysis Literary Lang		Questionnaires: 23
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	3	14	4.27	940/1542	4.39	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	14	4.32	855/1542	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	0	1	6	11	4.20	865/1339	4.20	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	790/1498	4.29	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	442/1428	4.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	530/1407	4.49	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	3	3	14	4.23	870/1521	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1166/1541	4.45	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	832/1518	4.17	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	644/1472	4.39	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	727/1475	4.92	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	637/1471	4.49	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	2	15	4.53	671/1470	4.56	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	354/1310	3.99	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	306/1210	4.56	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	433/1211	4.49	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	402/1207	4.55	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	1	7	6	4.00	478/859	3.75	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 301 02		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 25			
Title: Analysis Literary Lang									Questionnaires: 20			
Instructor: Falco,Raphael												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	632/1542	4.39	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	810/1542	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	12	4.20	865/1339	4.20	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	2	13	4.26	843/1498	4.29	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	117/1428	4.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	335/1407	4.49	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	5	7	3.70	1238/1521	3.96	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1166/1541	4.45	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	709/1518	4.17	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	2	11	4.16	1155/1472	4.39	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1475	4.92	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	681/1471	4.49	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	588/1470	4.56	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	3	0	0	0	5	3.50	1064/1310	3.99	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	504/1210	4.56	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	777/1211	4.49	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	756/1207	4.55	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 301 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Analysis Literary Lang		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	713/859	3.75	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 302 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18			
Title:	Lit Methodologies Resear										Questionnaires: 15			
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	435/1542	4.67	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	324/1542	4.73	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	205/1339	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	380/1498	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	494/1428	4.40	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	375/1407	4.53	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	746/1521	4.33	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	1100/1541	4.53	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	494/1518	4.40	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	435/1472	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	879/1475	4.77	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	425/1471	4.69	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	361/1470	4.77	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	991/1310	3.67	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	546/1210	4.38	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	874/1211	4.13	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	537/1207	4.63	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 302 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	18
Title:	Lit Methodologies Resear			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/859	****	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 24	
Title:	Art Of The Essay							Questionnaires: 15	
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael								

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	691/1542	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	992/1542	4.20	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1339	****	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	767/1498	4.33	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	681/1428	4.20	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	375/1407	4.53	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	9	2	4	3.67	1257/1521	3.67	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1047/1541	4.60	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	686/1518	4.25	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	755/1471	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	865/1470	4.36	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1310	****	3.88	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	212/1210	4.80	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	507/1211	4.60	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	461/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 303 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Art Of The Essay			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	250/859	4.44	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 18		
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais										Questionnaires: 12		
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	250/1542	4.82	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	338/1542	4.73	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	244/1339	4.82	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	428/1498	4.60	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	442/1428	4.45	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	569/1407	4.36	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	278/1521	4.70	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1166/1541	4.45	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	686/1518	4.25	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	209/1472	4.91	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	538/1475	4.91	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	413/1471	4.70	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	297/1470	4.82	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1064/1310	3.50	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	615/1210	4.29	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	661/1211	4.43	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	703/1207	4.43	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 304 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 18
Title:	Brit Lit:Medieval/Renais			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 305 01		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 34				
Title: Brit Lit:Restor - Romant								Questionnaires: 27				
Instructor: Smith,Orianne M												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	499/1542	4.62	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	429/1542	4.65	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	507/1339	4.58	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	428/1498	4.60	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	102/1428	4.88	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	0	20	4.54	485/1521	4.54	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	14	4.54	1100/1541	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	334/1518	4.55	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	303/1472	4.84	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	186/1471	4.88	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	141/1470	4.92	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	3	0	0	1	5	3.56	1042/1310	3.56	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	162/1210	4.86	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	563/859	3.87	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 305 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 34
Title:	Brit Lit:Restor - Romant		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor:	Smith,Orianne M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	2	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 307 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 34
Title:	Am Lit To Civil War			Questionnaires: 26
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	11	12	4.27	951/1542	4.27	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	726/1542	4.42	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	626/1339	4.46	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	618/1498	4.46	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	228/1428	4.69	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	455/1407	4.46	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	518/1521	4.50	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	551/1541	4.92	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	11	9	4.26	675/1518	4.26	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	188/1472	4.91	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	484/1475	4.91	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	373/1471	4.74	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	399/1470	4.74	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	354/1310	4.48	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	331/1210	4.65	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	543/1211	4.55	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	508/1207	4.65	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.65

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 307 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment:	34
Title:	Am Lit To Civil War					Questionnaires:	26
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa						

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	2	0	4	4	6	3.75	607/859	3.75	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 35
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War			Questionnaires: 26
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	1043/1542	4.17	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	8	6	8	3.87	1236/1542	3.87	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	2	2	5	5	6	3.55	1198/1339	3.55	4.51	4.32	4.36	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	7	9	3.91	1149/1498	3.91	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	301/1428	4.61	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	973/1407	3.91	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	785/1521	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	12	2	3.71	1184/1518	3.71	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	614/1472	4.65	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	646/1475	4.87	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	977/1471	4.22	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	7	11	4.26	951/1470	4.26	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	4	9	8	4.00	761/1310	4.00	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	5	4	9	4.11	741/1210	4.11	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	3	9	3.95	962/1211	3.95	4.51	4.37	4.45	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	480/1207	4.68	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.68

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 308 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 35
Title:	Am Lit After Civil War		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/859	****	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 316 01		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 27					
Title:	Literature & Other Arts							Questionnaires: 19					
Instructor:	Osherow,Michele												

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	178/1542	4.89	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	454/1542	4.63	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	809/1339	4.28	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	15	4.63	392/1498	4.63	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	165/1428	4.78	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	662/1407	4.28	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	5	1	9	3.83	1182/1521	3.83	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	959/1541	4.71	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	326/1518	4.56	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	791/1472	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	17	4.74	933/1475	4.74	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	681/1471	4.47	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	336/1470	4.79	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	186/1310	4.68	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	116/1210	4.92	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 316 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	27
Title:	Literature & Other Arts			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Osherow,Michele				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	388/859	4.20	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 324 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 29
Title: Theories Of Comm Tech		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	8	10	4.08	1117/1542	4.08	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	4	11	3.88	1229/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	1105/1339	3.82	4.51	4.32	4.36	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	3	11	3.96	1109/1498	3.96	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	578/1428	4.30	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	9	8	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	8	3	9	3.63	1276/1521	3.63	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	5	9	7	3.83	1510/1541	3.83	4.59	4.70	4.71	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	2	3	8	4	3.82	1114/1518	3.82	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	1106/1472	4.23	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	861/1475	4.77	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	1087/1471	4.05	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	943/1470	4.27	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	596/1310	4.24	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	538/1210	4.38	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	497/1211	4.62	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	607/1207	4.54	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.54

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 324 01		Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment: 29	
Title:	Theories Of Comm Tech						Questionnaires: 24	
Instructor:	Maher,Jennifer							

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	547/859	3.91	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 326 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 35
Title: Structure Of English				Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	676/1542	4.48	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	1000/1542	4.19	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	507/1339	4.57	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	6	4	9	4.16	956/1498	4.16	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	6	8	3.90	985/1428	3.90	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	6	7	3.71	1102/1407	3.71	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	658/1521	4.40	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	920/1518	4.00	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	486/1472	4.74	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	808/1475	4.80	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	985/1471	4.20	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	588/1470	4.60	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1064/1310	3.50	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	667/1210	4.20	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	898/1211	4.07	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	4	5	4	3.73	1044/1207	3.73	4.57	4.41	4.51	3.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 326 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 35
Title:	Structure Of English			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	813/859	3.00	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 345 01		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 24				
Title:	Literature And History								Questionnaires: 13				
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	435/1542	4.67	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	297/1542	4.75	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1339	4.92	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	357/1498	4.67	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	181/1428	4.75	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	746/1521	4.33	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1434/1541	4.08	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	433/1518	4.45	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	319/1472	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	346/1471	4.75	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	498/1470	4.67	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	140/1310	4.75	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	513/1210	4.42	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	671/1211	4.42	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	630/1207	4.50	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	0	2	5	2	3.45	729/859	3.45	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.45

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 345 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 24			
Title:	Literature And History										Questionnaires: 13			
Instructor:	Orgelfinger,Gai													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 351 01		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 28				
Title: Studies In Shakespeare							Questionnaires: 21				
Instructor: Falco,Raphael											

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	499/1542	4.62	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	833/1542	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	825/1339	4.25	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	240/1498	4.76	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	117/1428	4.86	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	335/1407	4.57	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	5	9	4.05	1026/1521	4.05	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	689/1541	4.90	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	211/1518	4.71	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	5	10	4.10	1190/1472	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	700/1475	4.84	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	0	5	11	4.26	938/1471	4.26	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	399/1470	4.74	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1310	****	3.88	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	538/1210	4.38	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	698/1211	4.38	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	470/1207	4.69	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 351 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 28
Title:	Studies In Shakespeare			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Falco,Raphael			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	2	1	4	3	3.33	770/859	3.33	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	**ENGL 364 01**				**Term - Spring 2012**						**Enrollment: 30**			
Title:	**Persp On Women In Lit**										**Questionnaires: 23**			
Instructor:	**Fernandez,Jean**													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	780/1542	4.41	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	1052/1542	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	817/1339	4.27	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	790/1498	4.32	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	442/1428	4.45	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	530/1407	4.41	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	7	7	3.82	1194/1521	3.82	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	345/1541	4.95	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	832/1518	4.12	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	538/1475	4.90	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	587/1471	4.55	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	752/1470	4.45	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/1310	****	3.88	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	467/1210	4.46	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	558/1211	4.54	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	790/1207	4.31	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 364 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Persp On Women In Lit			Questionnaires:	23
Instructor:	Fernandez,Jean				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/859	****	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 369 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 31			
Title:	Race Ethnicity US Lit										Questionnaires: 23			
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	608/1542	4.52	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	256/1542	4.78	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	141/1339	4.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	275/1498	4.74	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	173/1428	4.76	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	208/1407	4.71	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	419/1521	4.59	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	754/1541	4.86	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	721/1518	4.22	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	105/1472	4.95	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	163/1471	4.90	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	177/1470	4.91	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	354/1310	4.48	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	90/1210	4.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	433/1211	4.69	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	164/1207	4.94	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.94

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 369 01			Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 31		
Title:	Race Ethnicity US Lit												Questionnaires: 23		
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa														

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	572/859	3.85	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.85

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 371 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 16
Title:	Creative Writing-Fiction			Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Kenny,Meghan An			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	560/1542	4.56	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	297/1542	4.75	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	205/1339	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	194/1498	4.80	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	336/1428	4.56	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	66/1407	4.94	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	772/1521	4.31	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1124/1541	4.50	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	373/1518	4.50	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	520/1472	4.71	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	673/1475	4.86	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	306/1471	4.79	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	336/1470	4.79	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	626/1310	4.20	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	282/1210	4.71	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1211	4.71	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	289/1207	4.86	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 371 01		Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment: 16
Title:	Creative Writing-Fiction						Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Kenny,Meghan An						

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	91/859	4.83	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 373 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 8
Title: Creative Writing-Poetry		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Gwiazda,Piotr K		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	929/1542	4.29	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	528/1542	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1339	****	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	464/1498	4.57	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	747/1428	4.14	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	948/1541	4.71	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	588/1518	4.33	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1472	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	346/1471	4.75	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	374/1470	4.75	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	140/1310	4.75	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1210	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	739/1211	4.33	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 373 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 8
Title:	Creative Writing-Poetry			Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Gwiazda,Piotr K			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	315/859	4.33	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 379 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 21
Title: Prins/Pract In Tech Comm		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Maher,Jennifer		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1131/1542	4.06	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1271/1542	3.81	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	757/1339	4.33	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	745/1498	4.36	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	6	2	3.31	1300/1428	3.31	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	810/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	2	4	3	3	3.07	1425/1521	3.07	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1525/1541	3.63	4.59	4.70	4.71	3.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	865/1518	4.08	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1340/1472	3.77	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1226/1475	4.46	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1163/1471	3.92	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1108/1470	4.00	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	717/1310	4.08	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	485/1210	4.44	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	213/1211	4.89	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1207	4.89	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 379 01		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	21
Title:	**Prins/Pract In Tech Comm**				**Questionnaires:**	**16**
Instructor:	**Maher,Jennifer**					

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	173/859	4.63	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 20
Title:	Intro To News Writing		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	1006/1542	4.21	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1091/1542	4.07	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	529/1339	4.56	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	854/1498	4.25	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	5	5	3.85	1030/1428	3.85	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	517/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1219/1521	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1230/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	452/1472	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	770/1471	4.42	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	800/1470	4.42	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	948/1310	3.75	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1095/1210	3.25	4.34	4.18	4.27	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	580/1211	4.50	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	402/1207	4.75	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 380 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Intro To News Writing			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Weiss,Kenneth N			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/859	****	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Feature Writing		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	486/1542	4.63	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	541/1542	4.56	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	825/1339	4.25	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	646/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1015/1428	3.87	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	559/1407	4.38	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	976/1541	4.69	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	652/1518	4.29	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	778/1472	4.54	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	673/1475	4.86	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	488/1471	4.64	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	692/1470	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1020/1310	3.60	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	339/1210	4.64	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	315/1211	4.79	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	449/1207	4.71	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	388/859	4.20	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 382 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Feature Writing		Questionnaires: 16
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
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	3.84	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 383 01					Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 24		
Title:	Science Writing												Questionnaires: 13		
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin														

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	223/1542	4.85	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1542	4.85	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	694/1339	4.40	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	167/1498	4.85	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	292/1428	4.62	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	122/1407	4.85	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	838/1521	4.25	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1038/1541	4.62	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1518	4.82	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	167/1472	4.92	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	233/1471	4.85	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	453/1470	4.69	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1310	****	3.88	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	430/1210	4.50	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	267/1207	4.88	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 383 01		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 24
Title:	Science Writing					Questionnaires: 13
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
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.21	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	2.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 383 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 24
Title:	Science Writing			Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Farabaugh,Robin			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 385 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	New Media, Digital Lit		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	676/1542	4.48	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	954/1542	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	638/1339	4.45	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	660/1498	4.43	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	3	10	3.81	1061/1428	3.81	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	828/1407	4.10	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	395/1521	4.62	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	345/1541	4.95	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	373/1518	4.50	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	728/1472	4.57	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	879/1475	4.76	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	922/1471	4.29	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	788/1470	4.43	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	761/1310	4.00	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	681/1210	4.19	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	164/1207	4.94	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 385 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	New Media, Digital Lit		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.67	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.47	4.32	4.44	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	2.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 385 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	New Media, Digital Lit			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Burgess,Helen J			

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	608/1542	3.41	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	229/1542	3.85	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1339	4.40	4.51	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	128/1498	4.03	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	421/1428	3.61	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	141/1407	3.92	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	395/1521	3.71	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	771/1541	4.67	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	142/1518	3.74	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	209/1472	3.48	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	269/1475	4.41	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	163/1471	3.53	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1470	3.47	4.32	4.33	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	140/1310	4.75	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	323/1210	3.39	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	507/1211	3.67	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1207	4.03	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	158/859	3.31	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01									Enrollment: 27
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument				Term - Spring 2012					Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray									

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.63	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/210	****	4.65	4.17	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	4.33	4.57	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Terhorst II,Ray			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	2.75	4.29	2.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	0	3	3	3.17	1487/1542	3.41	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1394/1542	3.85	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	582/1339	4.40	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1253/1498	4.03	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1173/1428	3.61	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1187/1407	3.92	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1347/1521	3.71	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	836/1541	4.67	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	5	0	3.38	1344/1518	3.74	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	1439/1472	3.48	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	1271/1475	4.41	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	0	2	3	3.10	1403/1471	3.53	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1423/1470	3.47	4.32	4.33	4.35	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1310	4.75	3.88	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1117/1210	3.39	4.34	4.18	4.27	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	1178/1211	3.67	4.51	4.37	4.45	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	993/1207	4.03	4.57	4.41	4.51	3.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	849/859	3.31	4.13	4.08	4.13	2.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 391 03		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title: Adv Expos & Argument				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Brofman,Margare				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1498/1542	3.41	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	7	5	3.71	1322/1542	3.85	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1140/1339	4.40	4.51	4.32	4.36	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	4	8	3.94	1119/1498	4.03	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	4	3	3	3.00	1360/1428	3.61	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	5	7	3.76	1075/1407	3.92	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	1188/1521	3.71	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	721/1541	4.67	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1100/1518	3.74	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	2	5	4	2	3.00	1439/1472	3.48	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	1341/1475	4.41	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	5	3	3	3.13	1400/1471	3.53	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	6	3	3	3.20	1385/1470	3.47	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1310	4.75	3.88	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	2	4	2	2.79	1177/1210	3.39	4.34	4.18	4.27	2.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	4	5	3	3.50	1100/1211	3.67	4.51	4.37	4.45	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	4	3	5	3.64	1067/1207	4.03	4.57	4.41	4.51	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	826/859	3.31	4.13	4.08	4.13	2.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 03		Term - Spring 2012					Enrollment: 25		
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument							Questionnaires: 17		
Instructor:	Brofman,Margare									

| | | | | **Frequencies** | | | | | **Instructor** | | **Course** | **Org** | **UMBC** | **Level** | **Sect** |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	4.25	4.27	3.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 29
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	McGurrin,Anthon			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	5	3	2	2.88	1523/1542	3.41	4.21	4.33	4.37	2.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	4	4	3.35	1446/1542	3.85	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1339	4.40	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1319/1498	4.03	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	2	4	3.31	1300/1428	3.61	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1175/1407	3.92	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	3	4	2	2.94	1449/1521	3.71	4.05	4.20	4.23	2.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1415/1541	4.67	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	4	3	3	2	2.93	1442/1518	3.74	4.15	4.11	4.13	2.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	1	3	3	3	3.00	1439/1472	3.48	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	1389/1475	4.41	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	3	2	3	3	3.00	1410/1471	3.53	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	2	2	3	2.79	1431/1470	3.47	4.32	4.33	4.35	2.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1310	4.75	3.88	4.06	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1123/1210	3.39	4.34	4.18	4.27	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1086/1211	3.67	4.51	4.37	4.45	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1081/1207	4.03	4.57	4.41	4.51	3.57

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 391 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 29
Title:	Adv Expos & Argument			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														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/859	3.31	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3

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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1173/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	357/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1292/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	746/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1455/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
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						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 02	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Fallon,Michael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	869/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	416/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1046/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1022/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	498/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 02	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	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	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 3			
Title:	Tutorial In Writing										Questionnaires: 3			
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	833/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	357/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	252/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	330/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1455/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	244/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 03	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment:	3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires:	3
Instructor:	Fallon,Michael			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 04	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 4
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1122/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1239/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	405/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1331/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	817/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	897/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1104/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1268/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1283/1310	4.03	3.88	4.06	4.11	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	769/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 4
Instructor:	Mabe,Mitzi			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/32	5.00	4.13	4.20	3.88	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.25	4.27	3.17	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	28/29	2.00	2.75	4.29	2.17	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 05	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	869/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1122/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	767/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	252/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1434/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	588/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	817/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	499/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 05	Term - Spring 2012		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														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	315/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 06	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Mabe,Mitzi		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1504/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1453/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1455/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1360/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1387/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1509/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1501/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1459/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1454/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1405/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	761/1310	4.03	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1123/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	918/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 06		Term - Spring 2012		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														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	478/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
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	3
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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	435/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	518/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	201/1310	4.03	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 07	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 08	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 2
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor: Fitzpatrick,Car		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1173/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1122/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1058/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	405/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	518/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	920/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1222/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1108/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	761/1310	4.03	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 08		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	2
Title:	Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires:	2
Instructor:	Fitzpatrick,Car					

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	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	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 09	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Porter,Jane		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	435/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	833/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	767/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1409/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	746/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1222/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1104/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1108/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 09		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing					Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Porter,Jane					

Questions	NR	NA	**Frequencies** 1	2	3	4	5	**Instructor** Mean	Rank	**Course** Mean	**Org** Mean	**UMBC** Mean	**Level** Mean	**Sect** Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	216/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.50

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	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			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 392 10	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title: Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor: Porter,Jane		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1409/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1046/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	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	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 11	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Porter,Jane			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	435/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1428	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	244/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1310	4.03	3.88	4.06	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 11		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing				Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Porter,Jane				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/859	4.73	4.13	4.08	4.13	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	3	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	3	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 12		Term - Spring 2012				Enrollment: 4
Title:	Tutorial In Writing						Questionnaires: 3
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	746/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1268/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	244/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1471	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 12		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 4
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
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	692/1470	4.39	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.50

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 13	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing		Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1542	4.44	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1122/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1498	4.44	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	874/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1331/1521	3.97	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1124/1541	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1518	4.44	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1439/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1475	4.98	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1123/1210	4.55	4.34	4.18	4.27	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.51	4.37	4.45	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 392 13	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 3
Title:	Tutorial In Writing			Questionnaires: 2
Instructor:	Pekarske,Nicole			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1207	4.70	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 26			
Title:	Technical Communication									Questionnaires: 15			
Instructor:	James,Annie D												

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	5	2	1	2.53	1535/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	2.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	5	2	2	2.80	1517/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1283/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	1417/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	3	2	2	2.64	1405/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	2.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1192/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	5	2	2	2.80	1470/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	551/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1483/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	2.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	4	5	1	3.07	1434/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1295/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	1427/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	2.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	7	2	1	2.79	1431/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	2.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1271/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	774/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	918/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	James,Annie D			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication					Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Rollins,John V					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1465/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	1122/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1160/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1058/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	1309/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	846/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	1	6	3.33	1378/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	551/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1265/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1394/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1173/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1155/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	2	3	3.07	1402/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1177/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1045/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1025/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	918/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 02		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication					Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Rollins,John V					

							Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion																
4. Were special techniques successful			10	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	797/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 03		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 25		
Title:	Technical Communication										Questionnaires: 20		
Instructor:	Sly-Thompson,Al												

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	3	4	6	1	2.74	1528/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	2.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	1	3	7	4	3.32	1459/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	2	0	6	2	2	3.17	1282/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	1	7	5	3.75	1239/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	9	1	4	3.31	1300/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	6	3	5	3.56	1175/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	0	4	6	5	3.71	1238/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	3	6	3	2	3.13	1404/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	2	6	3	2	2.82	1456/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	2.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	2	5	4	4	3.35	1461/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	3.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	2	6	2	4	3.12	1401/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	7	3	2	3.00	1405/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	2	5	1	1	2.73	1265/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	2.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	1165/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1159/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	918/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 03	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Sly-Thompson,Al			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	4.50	4.65	4.17	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	3.25	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	3.50	4.25	4.27	3.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	3.50	2.75	4.29	2.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 26			
Title:	Technical Communication										Questionnaires: 19			
Instructor:	Porter,Jane													

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	14	4.42	750/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	656/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	733/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	4	7	3.79	1075/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	14	4.47	442/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	369/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	318/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	435/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	592/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	488/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	438/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	666/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 04	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Porter,Jane			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 05	Term - Spring 2012										Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Technical Communication											Questionnaires: 12			
Instructor:	Walters,April I														

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1399/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1208/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	802/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1134/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	973/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1331/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	853/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1184/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1052/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	592/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	985/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	324/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	667/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	311/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 05		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Technical Communication										Questionnaires: 12			
Instructor:	Walters,April I													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	4.50	4.65	4.17	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	4.00	4.25	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	3.75	3.88	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	3.75	3.88	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	3.75	4.00	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	3.25	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	3.75	3.75	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	3.50	4.25	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	4.33	4.33	4.57	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 05	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Walters,April I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	3.50	2.75	4.29	2.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 25			
Title:	Technical Communication										Questionnaires: 13			
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1173/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	967/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	488/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	519/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	480/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1201/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	920/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	0	1	0	4	3.00	1439/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1344/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	0	2	4	3.78	1236/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1361/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1033/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 06	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Hess,Laurie			

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 07		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication				Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Rabinowitz,Jenn				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1285/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	1182/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	982/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	604/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	958/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	673/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	3	6	3.53	1317/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1191/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1375/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	871/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	808/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	985/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	934/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1028/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	774/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	507/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	722/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 07	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 15
Instructor:	Rabinowitz,Jenn			

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	646/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 24					
Title:	Technical Communication								Questionnaires: 12					
Instructor:	Walters,April I													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	0	5	1	2	2.75	1527/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1504/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	1	1	3	2	3.00	1455/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	5	2	3.17	1335/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1251/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1392/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1387/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	4	0	4	4	0	2.67	1479/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	1	2	2	2.82	1456/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	2.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	1290/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	3	1	1	2.60	1451/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	2.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1405/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	3	2	1	2	2.64	1274/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1007/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	352/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1155/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	216/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Walters,April I		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	4.67	4.63	4.12	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/210	4.50	4.65	4.17	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	4.67	4.67	4.50	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	4.33	4.47	4.32	4.44	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	4.00	4.25	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	3.75	3.88	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	3.75	3.88	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/67	3.75	4.00	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	3.25	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	3.75	3.75	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	3.50	4.25	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	4.33	4.33	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	3.50	2.75	4.29	2.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 08	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 24
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor:	Walters,April I		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	995/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1069/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	825/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	549/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	821/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	355/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	395/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1340/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	12	2	4.00	920/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	629/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	1263/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	770/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	728/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	728/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	523/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	682/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	556/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	478/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09		Term - Spring 2012							Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication									Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L									

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/210	4.50	4.65	4.17	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	4.00	4.25	4.60	4.68	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	3.75	3.88	4.50	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	3.75	3.88	4.54	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	3.75	4.00	4.17	4.46	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	3.25	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	3.75	3.75	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	3.50	4.25	4.27	3.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	4.33	4.33	4.57	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	3.50	2.75	4.29	2.17	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 09		Term - Spring 2012			Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication					Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L					

					Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 393 10		Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title: Technical Communication				Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Carbone,Christo				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1173/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	740/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	240/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	780/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	325/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	795/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	873/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	1058/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	987/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	846/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	1016/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	761/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	556/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 10	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor:	Carbone,Christo		

				Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication			Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	360/1542	3.66	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	684/1542	3.88	4.29	4.29	4.31	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	671/1339	3.91	4.51	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1498	4.14	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1061/1428	3.65	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	306/1407	4.13	4.38	4.15	4.20	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	185/1521	3.84	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1124/1541	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1518	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	503/1472	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1079/1475	4.47	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	785/1471	3.91	4.35	4.32	4.33	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	650/1470	3.78	4.32	4.33	4.35	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	606/1310	3.58	3.88	4.06	4.11	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	578/1210	3.94	4.34	4.18	4.27	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	641/1211	4.29	4.51	4.37	4.45	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	593/1207	4.25	4.57	4.41	4.51	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	158/859	4.17	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11		Term - Spring 2012						Enrollment: 25
Title:	Technical Communication								Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L								

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	6	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	28/207	4.67	4.63	4.12	4.17	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	49/210	4.50	4.65	4.17	4.21	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	81/202	4.67	4.67	4.50	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	113/202	4.33	4.47	4.32	4.44	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/199	****	4.40	4.15	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	60/69	4.00	4.25	4.60	4.68	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	62/68	3.75	3.88	4.50	4.51	3.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	68/73	3.75	3.88	4.54	4.55	3.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	54/67	3.75	4.00	4.17	4.46	3.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	26/32	3.25	4.13	4.20	3.88	3.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	22/35	4.25	4.25	4.36	4.08	4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	20/23	3.75	3.75	4.41	3.84	3.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	24/30	3.50	4.25	4.27	3.17	3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	14/19	4.33	4.33	4.57	4.33	4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	26/29	3.50	2.75	4.29	2.17	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 393 11		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment:	25
Title:	Technical Communication										Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Brown,Laura L											

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/18	****	****	4.25	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/13	****	****	4.14	1.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01		Term - Spring 2012									Enrollment: 13		
Title:	Internship in Tutoring W											Questionnaires: 9		
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	0	3.56	1421/1542	3.56	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1343/1542	3.67	4.29	4.29	4.31	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1339	****	4.51	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	854/1498	4.25	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1211/1428	3.56	4.20	4.12	4.15	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1126/1407	3.67	4.38	4.15	4.20	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4	0	3.00	1434/1521	3.00	4.05	4.20	4.23	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	771/1541	4.86	4.59	4.70	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	1489/1518	2.50	4.15	4.11	4.13	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1419/1472	3.33	4.38	4.46	4.46	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	861/1475	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1320/1471	3.56	4.35	4.32	4.33	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1361/1470	3.33	4.32	4.33	4.35	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1141/1310	3.33	3.88	4.06	4.11	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1210	****	4.34	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1211	****	4.51	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1207	****	4.57	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/859	****	4.13	4.08	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 395 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment:	13
Title:	Internship in Tutoring W			Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Hickernell,Mary				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.13	4.20	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	4.25	4.36	4.08	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.59	4.24	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	3.75	4.41	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 26			
Title:	Method Of Interpretation										Questionnaires: 21			
Instructor:	Berman,Jessica													

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	**NR**	**NA**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	572/1542	4.55	4.21	4.33	4.42	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	754/1542	4.40	4.29	4.29	4.33	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.51	4.32	4.44	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	524/1498	4.53	4.38	4.26	4.35	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	372/1428	4.53	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	505/1407	4.42	4.38	4.15	4.30	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	602/1521	4.44	4.05	4.20	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	937/1541	4.72	4.59	4.70	4.72	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	534/1518	4.38	4.15	4.11	4.18	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	435/1472	4.76	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	592/1475	4.88	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	413/1471	4.71	4.35	4.32	4.36	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	297/1470	4.81	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	201/1310	4.67	3.88	4.06	4.09	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	364/1210	4.62	4.34	4.18	4.34	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	402/1211	4.71	4.51	4.37	4.47	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	449/1207	4.71	4.57	4.41	4.53	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	377/859	4.22	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 401 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 26
Title:	Method Of Interpretation		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor:	Berman,Jessica		

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 405 01		Term - Spring 2012								Enrollment: 16		
Title:	Seminar In Literary Hist										Questionnaires: 14		
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	632/1542	4.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	352/1542	4.71	4.29	4.29	4.33	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1339	****	4.51	4.32	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	380/1498	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.35	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	212/1428	4.71	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	270/1407	4.64	4.38	4.15	4.30	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	356/1521	4.64	4.05	4.20	4.24	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.59	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	849/1518	4.09	4.15	4.11	4.18	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	303/1472	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	700/1475	4.85	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	244/1471	4.83	4.35	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1470	4.85	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	596/1310	4.23	3.88	4.06	4.09	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1210	4.83	4.34	4.18	4.34	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.51	4.37	4.47	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	311/1207	4.83	4.57	4.41	4.53	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	713/859	3.50	4.13	4.08	4.19	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 405 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 16
Title:	Seminar In Literary Hist		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	DiCuirci,Lindsa		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 18
Title:	Language In Society		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	548/1542	4.57	4.21	4.33	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	352/1542	4.71	4.29	4.29	4.33	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1339	****	4.51	4.32	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	380/1498	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.35	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	74/1428	4.93	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	297/1407	4.62	4.38	4.15	4.30	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	356/1521	4.64	4.05	4.20	4.24	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	551/1541	4.93	4.59	4.70	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	286/1518	4.62	4.15	4.11	4.18	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.78	4.72	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	186/1471	4.89	4.35	4.32	4.36	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1470	4.89	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1310	****	3.88	4.06	4.09	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	116/1210	4.92	4.34	4.18	4.34	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	174/1211	4.92	4.51	4.37	4.47	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	210/1207	4.92	4.57	4.41	4.53	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	169/859	4.64	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 407 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 18
Title:	Language In Society		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	McCarthy,Lucill		

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	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 410 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title: Seminar In Genre Studies		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: McKinley,Kathry		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	548/1542	4.57	4.21	4.33	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	528/1542	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.33	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	582/1339	4.50	4.51	4.32	4.44	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	549/1498	4.50	4.38	4.26	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	157/1428	4.79	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	405/1407	4.50	4.38	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	630/1521	4.43	4.05	4.20	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1394/1541	4.15	4.59	4.70	4.72	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	521/1518	4.38	4.15	4.11	4.18	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	553/1472	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	430/1475	4.92	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	696/1471	4.46	4.35	4.32	4.36	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	573/1470	4.62	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	863/1310	3.91	3.88	4.06	4.09	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	667/1210	4.20	4.34	4.18	4.34	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	415/1211	4.70	4.51	4.37	4.47	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	556/1207	4.60	4.57	4.41	4.53	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	732/859	3.44	4.13	4.08	4.19	3.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 410 01	Term - Spring 2012		Enrollment: 15
Title:	Seminar In Genre Studies			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	McKinley,Kathry			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/69	5.00	4.80	4.56	4.62	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	47/69	4.50	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	56/68	4.00	3.88	4.50	4.65	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	57/73	4.00	3.88	4.54	4.72	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	39/67	4.25	4.00	4.17	4.37	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENGL 480 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title: Seminar-Adv Journalism		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Corbett,Christo		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	360/1542	4.73	4.21	4.33	4.42	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	799/1542	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.33	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1339	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	392/1498	4.64	4.38	4.26	4.35	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	93/1428	4.91	4.20	4.12	4.22	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	201/1407	4.73	4.38	4.15	4.30	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1139/1521	3.91	4.05	4.20	4.24	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	689/1541	4.91	4.59	4.70	4.72	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1518	4.50	4.15	4.11	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	1022/1472	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	619/1475	4.88	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	513/1471	4.63	4.35	4.32	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	558/1470	4.63	4.32	4.33	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	546/1310	4.29	3.88	4.06	4.09	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	323/1210	4.67	4.34	4.18	4.34	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	261/1211	4.83	4.51	4.37	4.47	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	311/1207	4.83	4.57	4.41	4.53	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.00

Run Date: 6/29/2012 9:34:27 AM

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENGL 480 01	Term - Spring 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title:	Seminar-Adv Journalism		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor:	Corbett,Christo		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/69	****	4.80	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/69	****	4.25	4.60	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	3.88	4.50	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	3.88	4.54	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.00	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

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