

Course Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 25
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	840/1669	4.26	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	527/1666	4.34	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	657/1421	4.46	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	612/1617	4.37	4.49	4.15	3.99	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	324/1555	4.51	4.48	4.00	3.92	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	490/1543	4.20	4.45	4.06	3.86	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	401/1647	4.59	4.50	4.12	4.06	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	1115/1668	4.35	4.53	4.67	4.62	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	423/1605	4.34	4.37	4.07	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	473/1514	4.58	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	539/1551	4.84	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	135/1503	4.62	4.62	4.24	4.17	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	509/1506	4.55	4.67	4.26	4.17	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	3	1	4	3	3.07	1107/1311	4.03	4.29	3.85	3.68	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	340/1490	4.38	4.52	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.43	4.67	4.26	4.06	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.87	4.81	4.29	4.07	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	459/1006	3.37	3.97	4.00	3.81	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0						
						Other	4				

Course Section: AMST 100 0201
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 26
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	1117/1669	4.26	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	727/1666	4.34	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	557/1421	4.46	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	14	4.50	496/1617	4.37	4.49	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	340/1555	4.51	4.48	4.00	3.92	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	608/1543	4.20	4.45	4.06	3.86	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	213/1647	4.59	4.50	4.12	4.06	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	4.33	1329/1668	4.35	4.53	4.67	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	12	7	4.19	759/1605	4.34	4.37	4.07	3.96	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	993/1514	4.58	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1000/1551	4.84	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	9	11	4.32	823/1503	4.62	4.62	4.24	4.17	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	642/1506	4.55	4.67	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	432/1311	4.03	4.29	3.85	3.68	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	749/1490	4.38	4.52	4.05	3.85	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	3	12	4.41	741/1502	4.43	4.67	4.26	4.06	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	368/1489	4.87	4.81	4.29	4.07	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	965/1006	3.37	3.97	4.00	3.81	2.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	2	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: AMST 100 0301
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 27
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	757/1669	4.26	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	1028/1666	4.34	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1421	4.46	4.56	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	887/1617	4.37	4.49	4.15	3.99	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	340/1555	4.51	4.48	4.00	3.92	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	1035/1543	4.20	4.45	4.06	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	583/1647	4.59	4.50	4.12	4.06	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	4.11	1470/1668	4.35	4.53	4.67	4.62	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	565/1605	4.34	4.37	4.07	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	616/1514	4.58	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	307/1551	4.84	4.90	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	412/1503	4.62	4.62	4.24	4.17	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	623/1506	4.55	4.67	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	153/1311	4.03	4.29	3.85	3.68	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	658/1490	4.38	4.52	4.05	3.85	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	2	4	9	4.06	994/1502	4.43	4.67	4.26	4.06	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	299/1489	4.87	4.81	4.29	4.07	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	823/1006	3.37	3.97	4.00	3.81	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.90	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 105	****	4.68	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 98	****	4.70	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	

Course Section: AMST 100 0301
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 27
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 28
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.48	4.23	4.02	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	752/1666	4.35	4.45	4.19	4.11	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	710/1421	4.38	4.56	4.24	4.11	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	760/1617	4.29	4.49	4.15	3.99	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	369/1555	4.47	4.48	4.00	3.92	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	747/1543	4.18	4.45	4.06	3.86	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	885/1647	4.24	4.50	4.12	4.06	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1313/1668	4.35	4.53	4.67	4.62	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.37	4.07	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	424/1514	4.76	4.65	4.39	4.32	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.62	4.24	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	261/1506	4.82	4.67	4.26	4.17	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	2	3	2	5	3.27	1054/1311	3.27	4.29	3.85	3.68	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	206/1490	4.81	4.52	4.05	3.85	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	326/1502	4.81	4.67	4.26	4.06	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.81	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.97	4.00	3.81	3.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.90	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.68	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.70	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Course Section: AMST 100Y 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 28
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 29
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	647/1669	4.47	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	1192/1666	3.93	4.45	4.19	4.29	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.56	4.24	4.35	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.49	4.15	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	438/1555	4.40	4.48	4.00	3.96	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	850/1543	4.08	4.45	4.06	4.10	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1137/1647	3.93	4.50	4.12	4.19	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1170/1668	4.53	4.53	4.67	4.59	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	759/1605	4.20	4.37	4.07	4.15	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	1148/1514	4.14	4.65	4.39	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	409/1551	4.93	4.90	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.62	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	246/1311	4.55	4.29	3.85	3.96	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	12	4.47	490/1490	4.47	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	166/1502	4.93	4.67	4.26	4.31	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.81	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	441/1006	4.13	3.97	4.00	3.99	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	5 Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General	5 Under-grad 15 Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 30
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	375/1669	4.68	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	483/1666	4.56	4.45	4.19	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	728/1421	4.36	4.56	4.24	4.35	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	370/1617	4.63	4.49	4.15	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	124/1555	4.84	4.48	4.00	3.96	4.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	242/1543	4.68	4.45	4.06	4.10	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	9	10	4.16	948/1647	4.16	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.53	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55	343/1605	4.55	4.37	4.07	4.15	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	727/1514	4.57	4.65	4.39	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	537/1503	4.52	4.62	4.24	4.29	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	299/1506	4.79	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	7	3	10	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.29	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	380/1490	4.62	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	237/1502	4.90	4.67	4.26	4.31	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	280/1489	4.90	4.81	4.29	4.36	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.97	4.00	3.99	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: AMST 290 0201
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 31
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.48	4.23	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.45	4.19	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.56	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	424/1617	4.57	4.49	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	728/1555	4.07	4.48	4.00	3.96	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	210/1543	4.71	4.45	4.06	4.10	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	446/1647	4.54	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1406/1668	4.21	4.53	4.67	4.59	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	486/1605	4.42	4.37	4.07	4.15	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	663/1514	4.62	4.65	4.39	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	742/1503	4.38	4.62	4.24	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	613/1506	4.54	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1013/1311	3.36	4.29	3.85	3.96	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	405/1490	4.57	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.67	4.26	4.31	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	622/1489	4.57	4.81	4.29	4.36	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	381/1006	4.25	3.97	4.00	3.99	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	56/ 112	4.60	4.80	4.38	4.59	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.90	4.22	4.50	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	45/ 105	4.60	4.68	4.20	4.63	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	36/ 98	4.40	4.70	3.95	4.20	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: SABID, INGRID
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 32
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	293/1669	4.73	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	494/1666	4.56	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	538/1421	4.53	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	201/1555	4.70	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	195/1543	4.73	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	378/1647	4.59	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	1131/1668	4.59	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	1	0	1	8	14	4.42	486/1605	4.42	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	151/1514	4.93	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	335/1503	4.70	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	188/1506	4.88	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	214/1311	4.62	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	324/1490	4.68	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	119/1502	4.95	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	140/1489	4.95	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	17	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1006	****	3.97	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.90	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.68	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.70	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: SABID, INGRID
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 32
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 33
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	11	14	4.13	1077/1669	4.13	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	20	4.55	505/1666	4.55	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	255/1421	4.77	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	253/1617	4.72	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	5	7	13	3.93	889/1555	3.93	4.48	4.00	4.03	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	20	4.43	478/1543	4.43	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	412/1647	4.57	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.53	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	12	9	4.07	871/1605	4.07	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	7	20	4.55	739/1514	4.55	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	438/1503	4.62	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	446/1506	4.69	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	26	4.83	108/1311	4.83	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	832/1490	4.05	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	3	3	14	4.08	982/1502	4.08	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	585/1489	4.62	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	6	4	8	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	31	Non-major	24
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course Section: AMST 325 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 34
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	10	18	4.29	864/1669	4.51	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	20	4.44	634/1666	4.56	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	5	21	4.35	728/1421	4.59	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	9	18	4.24	821/1617	4.48	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	10	18	4.41	438/1555	4.38	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	11	17	4.34	571/1543	4.52	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	23	4.63	345/1647	4.68	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	16	16	4.45	1232/1668	4.43	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	3	8	13	4.11	840/1605	4.30	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	6	23	4.56	727/1514	4.64	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	677/1551	4.94	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	6	21	4.44	670/1503	4.63	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	5	21	4.44	731/1506	4.73	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	1	4	7	11	3.96	631/1311	4.36	4.29	3.85	3.97	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	6	16	4.35	613/1490	4.53	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	4	20	4.58	567/1502	4.65	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	456/1489	4.87	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	2	2	8	10	4.04	471/1006	4.16	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.04	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	13
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: AMST 325 0201
 Title: STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 35
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	281/1669	4.51	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	25	4.63	412/1666	4.56	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	10	23	4.51	547/1421	4.59	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.51	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	26	4.60	394/1617	4.48	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	25	4.63	249/1555	4.38	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	9	22	4.43	490/1543	4.52	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	29	4.71	250/1647	4.68	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	19	11	4.24	1388/1668	4.43	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	239/1605	4.30	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	291/1514	4.64	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	205/1551	4.94	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	277/1503	4.63	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	115/1506	4.73	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	6	12	13	4.23	464/1311	4.36	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	270/1490	4.53	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	95/1502	4.65	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1489	4.87	4.81	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	7	3	14	4.20	407/1006	4.16	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	12	Under-grad	35	Non-major	31
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course Section: AMST 325 8020
 Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 36
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	590/1669	4.51	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.56	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	151/1421	4.59	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.48	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	698/1555	4.38	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	142/1543	4.52	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	270/1647	4.68	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1668	4.43	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	830/1605	4.30	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	799/1514	4.64	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.94	4.90	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	347/1503	4.63	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	286/1506	4.73	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	79/1311	4.36	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	445/1490	4.53	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	754/1502	4.65	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1489	4.87	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	381/1006	4.16	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.25	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: AMST 354 0101
 Title AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 37
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	128/1669	4.90	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	62/1666	4.95	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	217/1421	4.80	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	114/1617	4.90	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	124/1555	4.84	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	126/1543	4.84	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	145/1647	4.84	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	731/1668	4.89	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.65	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.62	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.67	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.29	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	326/1502	4.81	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	309/1489	4.88	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	185/1006	4.64	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: AMST 356 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS:COMM/DIVER
 Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 38
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	676/1666	4.42	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	253/1617	4.73	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.25	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1002/1647	4.08	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1004/1668	4.73	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.90	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	210/1503	4.82	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	394/1506	4.73	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	79/1311	4.91	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1502	4.70	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.90	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.68	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 98	****	4.70	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: AMST 356 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS:COMM/DIVER
 Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 38
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
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 to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course Section: AMST 357A 0101
 Title: SPORTS AND MEDIA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 39
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	12	16	4.26	901/1669	4.26	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	12	18	4.35	752/1666	4.35	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	19	4.41	670/1421	4.41	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	19	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	11	11	9	3.76	1054/1555	3.76	4.48	4.00	4.03	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	17	12	4.12	819/1543	4.12	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	22	4.41	634/1647	4.41	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	30	4	4.12	1470/1668	4.12	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	8	10	9	3.96	987/1605	3.96	4.37	4.07	4.09	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	10	20	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	622/1551	4.87	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	528/1503	4.53	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	2	4	10	13	4.17	495/1311	4.17	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	10	12	4.32	631/1490	4.32	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	613/1502	4.52	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	8	15	4.48	707/1489	4.48	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	8	5	4	3.40	810/1006	3.40	3.97	4.00	4.10	3.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 16		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	15
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: AMST 357B 0101
 Title THEORIES: MEDIA & CULTU
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 40
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	889/1669	4.27	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	1010/1666	4.14	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	909/1421	4.14	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	1098/1617	3.95	4.49	4.15	4.22	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	269/1555	4.59	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	10	4	3.76	1130/1543	3.76	4.45	4.06	4.14	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	896/1647	4.23	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1444/1668	4.15	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	11	4	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	1119/1551	4.59	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	823/1503	4.32	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	604/1506	4.55	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	458/1311	4.24	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	512/1490	4.44	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	531/1502	4.61	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	640/1489	4.56	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.97	4.00	4.10	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.68	4.20	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	8		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6								
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14		
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1								
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0								
				I	0				Other	5			
				?	1								

Course Section: AMST 391 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 41
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	769/1669	4.61	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	13	4.26	881/1666	4.44	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	280/1421	4.80	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	612/1617	4.40	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	108/1555	4.91	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	325/1543	4.71	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	378/1647	4.68	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	570/1668	4.92	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	551/1605	4.46	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	3	19	4.58	715/1514	4.58	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	862/1551	4.80	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	686/1503	4.46	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	5	16	4.35	828/1506	4.42	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	264/1311	4.17	4.29	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	692/1490	4.38	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	7	16	4.54	595/1502	4.73	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	596/1489	4.76	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	479/1006	4.11	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.68	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.70	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 7	General 0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 6
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 23

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	175/1669	4.61	4.48	4.23	4.28	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	425/1666	4.44	4.45	4.19	4.20	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.80	4.56	4.24	4.25	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	662/1617	4.40	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	80/1555	4.91	4.48	4.00	4.03	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1543	4.71	4.45	4.06	4.14	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	204/1647	4.68	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.92	4.53	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	343/1605	4.46	4.37	4.07	4.09	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	703/1514	4.58	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	705/1551	4.80	4.90	4.66	4.70	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	556/1503	4.46	4.62	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	642/1506	4.42	4.67	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	744/1311	4.17	4.29	3.85	3.97	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	445/1490	4.38	4.52	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	213/1502	4.73	4.67	4.26	4.28	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.76	4.81	4.29	4.35	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	393/1006	4.11	3.97	4.00	4.10	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.80	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.90	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.68	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.70	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: AMST 391 0201
 Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 42
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 43
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	102/1669	4.92	4.48	4.23	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	231/1666	4.77	4.45	4.19	4.22	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.56	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	102/1617	4.92	4.49	4.15	4.22	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	165/1555	4.77	4.48	4.00	4.08	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1543	4.85	4.45	4.06	4.18	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	270/1647	4.69	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1394/1668	4.23	4.53	4.67	4.70	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	194/1605	4.71	4.37	4.07	4.16	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	189/1514	4.91	4.65	4.39	4.45	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.90	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1503	4.91	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.67	4.26	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.29	3.85	3.88	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.52	4.05	4.26	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.67	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.81	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1006	4.88	3.97	4.00	4.21	4.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	4.80	4.38	4.74	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 92	4.80	4.90	4.22	4.48	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 105	4.75	4.68	4.20	4.27	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.70	3.95	3.86	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 43
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

